GAEKWAD'S ORIENTAL SERIES

No. CXXVIII

Vol. IV, No. 2] [July, 1962

पुराणम्

PURĀNA

[Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa Department]

VYASA PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Subs.—Inland Rs. 12/- Foreign £1

पुराणम्—PURAṆA

Vol. IV, No. 2] व्यासपूर्णिमाऽङ्कः [17 July, 1962

लेखसूची—Contents

व्यास-वन्दना

व्यासं वसिष्ठनप्तारं शक्तेः पौत्रमकल्मषम् ।
पराशरात्मजं वन्दे शुकतातं तपोनिधिम् ॥

व्यासाय विष्णुरूपाय व्यासरूपाय विष्णवे ।
नमो वै ब्रह्मनिधये वासिष्ठाय नमो नमः ॥

(महाभा०, C.E., भीष्मपर्व, पृ० ३, टि०)

ब्रह्मसूत्रकृते तस्मै वेदव्यासाय वेधसे ।
ज्ञानशक्त्यवताराय नमो भगवतो हरेः ॥

(शारीरक भाष्य, भामती, मंगलाचरणश्लोक)

यन्न्याससूत्रग्रथितात्मबोधसौरभ्यगर्भश्रुतिपद्ममाला ।
प्रसाधयत्यद्वयमात्मतत्त्वं तं व्यासमाद्यं गुरुमानतोऽस्मि ॥

(वेदान्तकल्पतरु, मंगलाचरणश्लोक)

व्यास-वर्णनम्

तस्य कृष्णस्य कपिलां जटां दीप्ते च लोचने ।
बभ्रूणि चैव श्मश्रूणि दृष्ट्वा देवी न्यमीलयत् ॥

(महाभा०, १।१०६।५)

वामे कमण्डलुं बिभ्रद् दक्षिणे दण्डमुत्तमम् ।
पिशङ्गीभिर्जटाभिश्च राजितो महसां चयः ॥

(शिवपु०, उमासं०, ४४।३६)

एतस्मिन् समये व्यासो भस्मभूषितमस्तकः ।
रुद्राक्षाभरणश्चायात् जटाजूटविभूषितः ॥
पञ्चाक्षरं जपन् मन्त्रं शिवप्रेमसमाकुलः ॥

(शिवपु०, शतरुद्रसं०, ४७।२२, २३)

(रामशंकर भट्टाचार्य)

अगस्त्यप्रोक्तं पापशमनं नाम हरिशंकरस्तोत्रम्

(वामनपु०, वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणं, अ० ८८, श्लो० २-२७)

मत्स्यं नमस्ये देवेशं कूर्मं[1] देवेशमेव च ।
हयशीर्षं नमस्येऽहं भवं विष्णुं त्रिविक्रमम् ॥ २ ॥
नमस्ये माधवेशानौ हृषीकेषकुमारिलौ[2] ।
नारायणं नमस्येऽहं नमस्ते[3] गरुडासनम् ॥ ३ ॥
[4]जयेशं नरसिंहं[4] च रूपधारं[5] कुरुध्वजम् ।
कामपालमखण्डं च नमस्ये ब्राह्मणप्रियम् ॥ ४ ॥
अजितं विश्वकर्माणं पुण्डरीकं द्विजप्रियम् ।
हरिं[6] शंभुं नमस्ये च ब्रह्माणं सप्रजापतिम् ॥ ५ ॥
नमस्ये शूलबाहुं च देवं चक्रधरं तथा ।
शिवं विष्णुं सुवर्णाक्षं[7] गोपतिं पीतवाससम् ॥ ६ ॥
नमस्ये च गदापाणिं नमस्ये च कुशेशयम् ।
अर्धनारीश्वरं देवं नमस्ये पापनाशनम् ॥ ७ ॥
गोपालं च[8] सवैकुण्ठं नमस्ये चापधारिणम्[9] ।
नमस्ये विष्णुरूपं[10] च [11]ज्येष्ठेशं पञ्चमं तथा[11] ॥ ८ ॥[12]
उपशान्तं नमस्येऽहं मार्कण्डेयं सजम्बुकम् ।
नमस्ये पद्मकिरणं नमस्ये वडवामुखम् ॥ ९ ॥
कार्त्तिकेयं नमस्येऽहं बाह्लिकं[13] शङ्खिनं[14] तथा ।
नमस्ये पद्मकिरणं नमस्ये च कुशेशयम् ॥[15] १० ॥

अत्र काशीराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागे संवादितेभ्यो (Collated) वामनपुराणकोशेभ्यः केचिद् उपयोगिनः पाठभेदा निर्दिश्यन्ते । पाठान्तरयुतां देवनागरीलिपिकोशानां संख्याऽऽहृत्य कोष्ठेऽग्रे प्रदृश्यते, शारदालिपिकोशस्य 'शा०' इति पृथगेव निर्देशः क्रियते । वामनपुराणस्य संवादितकोशानां विवरणं तु 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः भाग ३, अङ्क १, पृष्ठ १३५-१३६ स्थले प्रदत्तम् ।

१. गोविन्दमेव (५, शा०) । २. ०कुमारिणौ (५, शा०) । ३. नमस्ये (२, शा०); तथैव (१) । ४. ऊर्ध्वकेशं नृसिंहं (४, शा०) । ५. रूपधारिकुरु० (५, शा०) । ६. हंसं (५, शा०) । ७. सुपर्णाक्षं (२) । ८. चैव वैकुण्ठं* (१, शा०) । ९, चापराजितं (५); त्वाऽपराजितं (१, शा०) । १०. विश्वरूपं (४, शा०) । ११. सौगन्धि सर्वदा शिवम् (४, शा०) । १२. अष्टमश्लोकात्परं पाठोऽधिकः—'पाञ्चालिकं हयग्रीवं स्वयम्भुममरेश्वरम् । नमस्ये पुष्करार्क्षं च प (अ-१, शा०) योगन्धिं च केशवम् ॥ अविमुक्तं च लोलं च ज्येष्ठेशं मध्यमं तथा । (५, शा०) । १३. वा (व-शा०) ह्लीकं (२), वाह्लीशं (२); वाल्मीकं (१) । १४. शिखिनं (४, शा०) । १५. उत्तरार्धं नास्ति (५ कोशेषु) ।

नमस्ये स्थाणुमनघं नमस्ये वनमालिनम् ।
नमस्ये लाङ्गलीशं च नमस्येऽहं श्रियः पतिम् ॥११॥
नमस्ये च त्रिनयनं नमस्ये हव्यवाहनम् ।
नमस्ये च त्रिसौवर्णं[16] नमस्ये धरणीधरम् ॥१२॥
त्रिणाचिकेतं ब्रह्माणं[17] नमस्ये शशिभूषणम्[18] ।
कपर्दिनं नमस्ये च सर्वामयविनाशनम् ॥१३॥
[19]नमस्ये शशिनं सूर्यं[19] ध्रुवं रुद्रं[20] महौजसम् ।
पद्मनाभं हिरण्याक्षं नमस्ये स्कन्दमव्ययम् ॥१४॥
नमस्येऽहं भीमहंसौ नमस्ये हाटकेश्वरम् ।
सदाहंसं[21] नमस्ये च नमस्ये प्राणतर्पणम् ॥१५॥
नमस्ये रुक्मकवचं महायोगिनमीश्वरम् ।
नमस्ये श्रीनिवासं च नमस्ये पुरुषोत्तमम् ॥१६॥
नमस्ये च चतुर्बाहुं नमस्ये च सुधाधिपम्[22] ।
वनस्पतिं[23] मधुपतिं[24] नमस्ये मनुमव्ययम्[25] ॥१७॥
श्रीकण्ठं वासुदेवं च नीलकण्ठं सदाशिवम्[26] ।
नमस्ये शर्वमनघं[27] गौरीशं लकुडेश्वरम्[28] ॥१८॥
मनोहरं च कृष्णेशं[29] नमस्ये चक्रपाणिनम् ।
यशोधनं[30] महाबाहुं नमस्ये च कुशप्रियम्[31] ॥१९॥
भूधरं छादितगदं[32] सुनेत्रं[33] सुरशंसितम्[34] ।
भद्राक्षं वीरभद्रं च नमस्ये शंकुकर्णिनम्[35] ॥२०॥
वृषध्वजं महेशं च विश्वामित्रं शशिप्रभम् ।
उपेन्द्रं च सगोविन्दं नमस्ये पङ्कजप्रियम् ॥२१॥

---

१६. त्रिसौपर्णं (३, शा०)। १७. ब्रह्मेशं (४, शा०)। १८. शक्तिभूषणं (१, शा०)। १९. सर्वदेवमयं सूर्यं (१)। २०. रौद्रं (४, शा०)। २१. महाहंसं (२)। २२. ०स्ये वसुधा० (३, शा०)। २३. नमस्यन्ति (शा०)। २४. पशुपति (४, शा०)। २५. प्रभुम० (५, शा०)। २६. सदखिडनम् (६)। २७. सर्व० (४, शा०)। २८. ल (न — २ ; च — १, शा०) कुलीश्वरं (१)। २९. ०रं कृष्णकेशं (४, शा०)। ३०. यशोधरं (३, शा०)। ३१. कुशेशयं (२, शा०); सुकेशवं (२)। ३२-३४. छादितगुहं त्रिनेत्रं शूलशङ्खिनौ (१, शा०)। ३४. शूलशङ्खिनौ (३); शूलशङ्खिनम् (२)। ३५. शङ्कुकर्णकम् (२, शा०), ०कर्षणम् (२)।

सहस्रशिरसं देवं नमस्ये कुन्दमालिनम् ।
[36]कालाग्नि रुद्रदेवेशं[36] नमस्ये कृत्तिवाससम् ॥२२॥

नमस्ये छागलेशं च नमस्ये पङ्कजासनम् ।
सहस्राक्षं कोकनदं नमस्ये हरिशंकरम् ॥२३॥

अगस्त्यं गरुडं विष्णुं कपिलं ब्रह्मवाङ्मयम् ।
सनातनं च ब्रह्माणं नमस्ये ब्रह्म तत्परम् ॥२४॥

अप्रतर्क्यं चतुर्बाहुं सहस्रांशुं तपोमयम् ।
नमस्ये धर्मराजानं देवं गरुडवाहनम् ॥२५॥

सर्वभूतगतं शान्तं निर्मलं सर्वलक्षणम् ।
महायोगिनमव्यक्तं नमस्ये पापनाशनम् ॥२६॥

निरञ्जनं निराकारं निर्गुणं निलयं[37] परम् ।
नमस्ये पापहर्तारं शरण्यं शरणं व्रजे ॥२७॥

[एतत् पवित्रं परमं पुराणं प्रोक्तं त्वगस्त्येन महर्षिणा च ।
धन्यं यशस्यं बहुपापनाशनं संकीर्तनात् [38]स्मरणात् स्पर्शनाच्च[38] ॥२८॥ [39]

३६. कालाग्निरुद्रं देवेशं (४, शा०)। ३७. निर्मलं (२, शा०); निर्ममं (१); ३८ स्मरणात् संश्रवाच्च (१); संस्मरणाश्रवाच्च (१); स्मरणात् सेवनाच्च (१, शा०); श्रवणात् स्मरणाच्च (१)। ३९. अयं श्लोको न विद्यते (१ कोशे)।

टि० ८. *वैकुण्ठं, अत्र तुलनार्थं द्रष्टव्यम्—

नरो नारायणश्चैव सर्वज्ञः सर्वभूतभृत् ।
देवा वैकुण्ठ इत्याहुर् वेदा विष्णुरिति प्रभुम् ॥

(महाभा०, C. E., भीष्मपर्व, ६. २१)

'वैकुण्ठ (cf. VI. 9. 21c; 6. 21-15b) is a personal name and not a place name, as it became in later litertaure.'

(Mbh., C. E-, Bhīṣma Parvan, Appendix)

(आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त)

भारतीयराजनीतौ पुराणपञ्चलक्षणम्

पं॰ राजेश्वरशास्त्री द्रविड

[It has been generally held by Indologists that the five characteristics of the Purāṇas (*sarga*, *pratisarga* etc), which have been mentioned in the Amarakośa (*circa* 5th century A. C.), as well as in some of the Purāṇas, had originally formed the main subject-matter of the Purāṇas, and that the religious topics were added to them afterwards. But in this article the author brings to light an altogether different *pañcalakṣaṇa*-definition of the Purāṇas, quoted in the *Jayamāṅgalā* commentary of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. This definition mentions *dharma* as one of the five characteristics of the Purāṇas, and so it differs from the well-known classical *pañcalakṣaṇa*-definition. It has not yet been traced in any of the Purāṇas, and so it may be said to represent a different tradition of the *Purāṇa-pañcalakṣaṇa*, which might have been contained in some old works of the Paurāṇika-school. The quotation of this *pañcalakṣaṇa* definition, which had probably sunk into oblivion, may be said to be a valuable contribution of the *Jayamaṅgalā*, the famous work on ancient Indian politics, to the Purāṇic thoughts.

On the strength of this definition of the Purāṇa, the learned writer has shown here that the dharma-śāstra-material, though forming a secondary topic in the Purāṇas was, nevertheless, originally included in them, and not interpolated later on.

The writer has also examined the views of some of the modern Indologists on the *pañcalakṣaṇa*-defini-

tion of the Purāṇas. In his opinion the sense of the *Amarakośa-definition* must conform to the sense of the *Jayamaṅgalā-definition*, and so the word '*Manvantara*' in the Amarakośa-definition should be explained as to include in it the topic of *dharma* also, as the Bhāgavata Purāṇa has already explained it by the words 'मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्मः (2. 1. 3)

In the end the author has stressed the need of studying the works on the *Rājanīti* for properly editing and interpreting the Purāṇas.]

"पुराणन्यायमीमांसा धर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।
वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥" (या. स्मृ. आ. ३)

इति याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृत्युक्त्यनुसारेण पुराणानां धर्मप्रतिपादकत्वं परम्परागतं खत्सम्प्रदायसिद्धमिति सर्वे जानन्ति । न केवलमस्मदीयसत्सम्प्रदायसिद्धमेतदपि तु बौद्धजयमङ्गलादिकृद्विवेचनेऽप्ययमंशः प्रमाणितो भवति । तथाहि तत्रत्यो ग्रन्थः—

"कः पुनरितिहास इत्याह पुराणमिति । सृष्ट्यादिज्ञानफलम् । तथा चोक्तम्—
"सृष्टिप्रवृत्तिसंहारधर्ममोक्षप्रयोजनम् ।
ब्रह्मभिर्विविधैः प्रोक्तं पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥" इति ।

(कौ. अ. १-५ व्याख्या जयमङ्गला)

अनेन हि ग्रन्थेन धर्मविज्ञानमपि पुराणपञ्चलक्षणान्तर्गतमेकं लक्षणमिति प्रतीयते । एतदविरोध्येव याज्ञवल्क्यवचनं पुराणानां धर्मस्थानत्वं प्रतिपादयति । किम्बहुना ? "सृष्टिप्रवृत्तिसंहारे"त्युक्ते वचने स्थितिपर्यायायाः प्रवृत्तेरुपादानाद्व्यावहारिकाणां विषयाणामपि प्रतिपादनं तत्र युज्यते इति स्फुटम् ।

"भूतमात्रेन्द्रियधियां जन्म सर्ग उदाहृतः ।
ब्रह्मणो गुणवैषम्याद्विसर्गः पौरुषः स्मृतः ॥
स्थितिर्वैकुण्ठविजयः पोषणं तदनुग्रहः ।
मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्म ऊतयः कर्मवासनाः ॥" (भाग. २, १-३)

इति श्रीमद्भागवतेऽपि पुराणस्य पञ्चलक्षणान्तर्गतो मन्वन्तरभागः सद्धर्म इत्युक्त्या पुराणानां धर्मप्रतिपादकत्वं व्यवस्थाप्यते। अतोऽस्त्येव पुराणेष्वपि धर्मशास्त्रस्यान्तर्भाव इति सिद्ध्यति।

कथं तर्हि याज्ञवल्क्यवचने धर्मशास्त्राणां पुराणेभ्यः पृथग्गणनमिति प्रश्नस्त्वत्रानुचितः। प्रसङ्गाद्धर्मप्रतिपादनस्यैव पुराणविषयत्वात् प्राधान्येन धर्मशास्त्रस्य धर्मप्रतिपादनविषयत्वेनाविरोधात्। "तत्त्वमसी"ति वाक्यघटकत्व-म्पदार्थकर्मकर्तृजीवस्वरूपविशुद्ध्यर्थं धर्मशास्त्राणां, तत्पदार्थेशस्वरूपविशुद्ध्यर्थं पुराणानां प्राधान्येन प्रवृत्तिरिति हि सिद्धान्तो माधवाचार्यैः सूतसंहितान्तर्गतस्य—

"ब्रह्मा सर्वजगत्कर्ता शिवस्य परमात्मनः।

प्रसादादेव रुद्रस्य स्मृतीः सस्मार सुव्रतः॥" (सूतसं. १, ४१)

इति श्लोकस्य व्याख्यानावसरे निर्णीतः। तद्यथाः—

"वेदे हि द्वौ भागौ कर्मभागो ज्ञानभागश्चेति। आद्यस्यार्थः स्मृतिमुखेन ब्रह्मणा शिवाज्ञयैव व्याख्यातः। द्वितीयस्य तु विष्णुना व्यासरूपेणावतीर्य पुराणमुखेनेति स्मृतिपुराणानां वेदमूलता न स्वातन्त्र्यमित्यर्थः।

यद्यपि स्मृतिष्वपि विद्यानिरूपणमस्ति, तथापि तत्प्रासङ्गिकद्रव्यशुद्धिप्रसङ्गेन हि कथितम् "क्षेत्रज्ञस्येश्वरज्ञानाद्विशुद्धिः परमा मता" इति। चतुर्थाश्रमधर्मप्रसङ्गेन चौपनिषदतत्त्वनिरूपणं कृतमिति। पुराणानां तु विद्याप्राधान्यम्, प्रासङ्गिकं कर्मनिरूपणम्। पुराणेषु हि जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकारणत्वं शिवस्याभिप्रेत्योत्पत्ति कारणत्वं सर्गेणोक्तम्। लयकारणत्वं च प्रतिसर्गेण। स्थितिकारणत्वं च वंशमन्वन्तरवंशानुचरितनिरूपणेन। तत्प्रसङ्गादाश्रमधर्मा आगता इति। अतएव धर्मविषये स्मृतिपुराणविप्रतिपत्तौ स्मृतीनां प्राबल्यं तत्र तासां तात्पर्यत इति, तत्त्वज्ञानविषये पुराणप्राबल्यमिति विवेकः।" इति।

इह केचिदाधुनिका इतिहाससंशोधका आहुः—

"पुराणानि स्वप्राचीनतमस्वरूपे केषां केषां विषयाणां प्रतिपादकान्यासन्निति न निश्चयेन वक्तुं शक्यते। अमरकोशस्य, वर्तमानानामनेकेषां पुराणानां चानुसारेण

पुराणेषु सर्गः, प्रतिसर्गः, वंशः, मन्वन्तराणि; वंशानुचरितं चेति पञ्चविषया आवश्यकाः। एतेषां पञ्चानामपि लक्षणानां मूलम् आख्यानम्, उपाख्यानम्, गाथा, कल्पोक्तिश्चेति चतुष्टयमेव। ब्रह्माण्ड. २-३४-२१, वायु. ६०-२१, विष्णु. ३-६-१६, एतेषां वचनानामनुसारेण महर्षिव्यासः उक्तचतुष्टयमवलम्ब्यैव पुराणसंहितां रचयामासेति सिद्ध्यति। अतः पुराणैः स्वप्राचीनस्वरूपे सर्गादिपञ्चविषयाणामेव प्राधान्येन वर्णनं क्रियते स्मेत्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहः। परन्तु वर्तमानेषु पुराणग्रन्थेषु एतेषां विषयाणां क्वचित्पूर्णतया क्वचिदंशतश्चोपेक्षा कृता वर्तते। धार्मिकेभ्यः सामाजिकेभ्यश्च विषयेभ्योऽत्यन्तं महत्त्वं दत्त-मित्युपलभ्यते। येषु पुराणेषूक्तलक्षाणानां पूर्णतयांऽशतो वा वर्णनं दृश्यते, तेष्वपि धार्मिकाणां स्मार्तानां च विषयाणां वर्णनमस्तीति"

(हाजरा, पुराणिक रिकार्ड्स पृ० ४-५)

"यदा धार्मिकेषु स्मार्तेषु च विषयेषु पुराणानां प्रामाण्यमङ्गीकृतम् तदा पुराणानां मुख्यविषयेषु पञ्चसु लक्षणेषु लोकानां धारणा एतादृशी सम्पन्ना, यत्-एतानि पञ्च लक्षणानि केवलमुपपुराणानामेव, महापुराणानां तु दशलक्षणान्यावश्यकानि, येषु धार्मिकाणां स्मार्तानां च विषयाणां प्राधान्यं स्यादिति। अतो राज्ञां ऋषीणां च वंशं वंशानुचरितं च प्रति विशेषतोऽवधानं न कृतम्। एवं, वंशं वंशानुचरितं च शुद्धया ऐतिहासिकदृष्ट्या न लिखित्वा प्रायः कल्पनैवाश्रितेति"

(हाजरा, पु० रि. पृ. ७)

"अमरकोशस्यानेकेषां पुराणानां चानुसारेण सर्गादयः पञ्चैव पुराणानां विषयाः। "वंशानुचरित"मित्यत्र "भूम्यादेः संस्थान"मिति पाठोऽप्युपलभ्यते, यस्यार्थः, "पौराणिको भुवनकोश" इति। परन्तु वर्तमानेषु पुराणेषु यत्किमपि, पुराणमेतस्याः पञ्चलक्षणरूपायाः परिभाषाया अनुसरणं पूर्णतया न करोति। केषुचित्पुराणेषु पञ्चलक्षणापेक्षयाऽधिका एव विषयाः उपलभ्यन्ते। केषुचिच्चैतेषां पञ्चविषयाणां किमपि वर्णनं नोपलभ्यते। प्रत्युत एतत्स्थानेऽ-न्येषामेव विषयाणां विस्तारो दृश्यते। किं च, वर्तमानकाले उपलब्धेषु पुराणेषु चत्वारिंशत्तमोंऽश (१।४०) एवोक्तलक्षणप्रतिपादकः। एतेनेदं सिद्ध्यति, यत्—प्राचीनपुराणानां मुख्यः प्रतिपाद्यो विषयो धर्मोपदेशो

नासीत्, तानि च मूलस्वरूपे साम्प्रदायिकभावनया न रचितान्यासन्निति। वर्तमानपुराणेषु हि दान-व्रत-तीर्थ-श्राद्धादिधार्मिकविषया एव मुख्यसामग्रीत्वेन वर्तन्ते, ये खलूक्तपञ्चलक्षणेष्वन्तर्गता न भवन्ति, पुराणानां पञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषां चावास्तविकतया केवलं सैद्धान्तिकीं कुर्वन्ति। अतः इमां दुरवस्थामपनेतुं पुराणेष्वेवायं सिद्धान्तः स्थापितो यत्—पञ्चलक्षणानि केवलमुपपुराणानाम्, मुख्यपुराणपरिभाषा तु दशलक्षणरूपा, यस्यां प्रवृत्तिः, रक्षा, मुक्तिः, हेतुः, अपाश्रयश्चेति धार्मिकविषया अप्यन्तर्गता भवन्ति। वर्तमानपुराणस्थाः केचन विषयाः पुनर्दशलक्षणेष्वपि नान्तर्भवन्ति। मत्स्यपुराणानुसारेण तु ब्रह्म-विष्णु-शिव-सूर्यादीनां माहात्म्यवर्णनं, धर्मार्थकाममोक्षप्रतिपादनं चोक्त-लक्षणातिरिक्तः पुराणानां विषयो वर्तते इति"

(पुसालकर, स्टडीज इन एपिक्स एण्ड दी पुराण, भूमिका, पृ० ४५-४६)

"प्रसिद्धसंस्कृतकोशभूते अमरकोशे, अनेकेषु पुराणेषु च पुराणानां पञ्चलक्षणान्युक्तानि। परन्तु "किरफिल"महोदयेनैतत्प्रदर्शितम्, यत्—पञ्चलक्षणानि तु पुराणानां चत्वारिंशत्तमांशरूपाण्येव भवन्ति। अतोऽवशिष्टानामेकोनचत्वारिंशदंशानाममरकोशानुसारेण पुराणत्वं न सिद्ध्यतीतीयं परिभाषा न युक्ता। पुराणानां मुख्यं लक्षणमिदमेव यत्पुरातनत्वम्, अतो यः कोऽपि पुरातनो विषयः पुराणप्रतिपाद्यो भवितुमर्हति। एवं च जीवनविषयकः सर्वोऽपि पक्षः पुराणान्तर्गतो भवतीति।

श्रीमद्भागवते पुराणानां दश लक्षणान्युक्तानि। किन्त्विमान्यपि चतुर्लक्षश्लोकपरिमितेषु पुराणेषु सम्पूर्णतया व्याप्तानि न भवन्ति। मत्स्य-पुराणस्थिता पुराणपरिभाषा तु बुद्धिसङ्गता वर्तते। तदनुसारेण सर्वेषु पुराणेषु सर्गादिपञ्चविषयातिरिक्ततया ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवार्कादीनां माहात्म्यस्य, संसारस्थितिसंहारयोर्धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणां च वर्णनमावश्यकं तद्विरुद्धविषयाणां च। पुराणप्रतिपाद्यविषयविषयकं पुराणस्थमेवेदं वचनं यद्यप्यधिकतया-व्यापकं भवति, तथापि पुराणस्थान् सर्वानपि विषयान्न व्याप्नोतीति"

(हरप्रसादशास्त्री, एशियाटिक सोसाइटी संस्कृत केट्लाग, भाग ५, भूमिका)

"वर्तमानपुराणानि पुराणनामयोग्यानि प्राचीनपुराणानि न सन्तीतीदं तथ्यं वर्तमानपुराणेषु यत्किमपि पुराणं पुराणोक्ताया एव पञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषाया अनुसरणं न करोतीत्यनेन प्रमाणितं भवति। प्राचीनपरिभाषामनुसृत्य प्रत्येकस्मिन् पुराणे सर्गः, प्रतिसर्गः, वंशः, मन्वन्तराणि, वंशानुचरितम्, अर्थात्—सूर्यवंशीयानां वा राज्ञां चरितं चेति पञ्च लक्षणान्यावश्यकानि। वर्तमानकाले यानि पुराणान्युपलब्धानि, तत्रोक्तपञ्चलक्षणात्मकस्त्वांशिक एव विषयो वर्तते। केषुचित्पुराणेष्वेतदपेक्षयाऽधिका एव विषयाः सन्ति। कानिचन पुराणान्येतेषां स्पर्शमपि न कुर्वन्ति। सर्वथा भिन्ना एव विषयास्तत्र निरूप्यन्ते। प्रायः सर्वेषां वर्तमानपुराणानां विषये विशेषरूपेणोल्लेखनीयोऽयं विषयो यदेतेषां साम्प्रदायिकतास्वरूपम्, अर्थात्—विष्णुशिवादिदेवेषु केन-चित्सम्बद्धता, यस्याः प्राचीनपञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषया पूर्णतयोपेक्षा कृता वर्तते।

येषु पुराणेषु प्राचीनस्वरूपं केनचिदंशेन सुरक्षितमस्ति, तेषु सृष्टिरचनायाः, आद्यकालीनेतिहासस्य च प्रकरणान्युपलभ्यन्ते। एवं पञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषानुसारेण मूलभूतयोः सूर्यचन्द्रयोर्वंशीयानां महाभारतकालीन-वीरपर्यन्तानां प्राचीनानां राज्ञां वंशावल्यपि तत्रोपलभ्यते इति"

(विंटरनिट्ज़, हिस्ट्री आफ इण्डियन लिटरेचर, पृ० ५२२-३)

अनेकेषु पुराणेषु प्रसिद्धेषु कोशेषु चोपलब्धायाः परिभाषाया अनुसारेण पुराणानां पञ्च लक्षणानि भवन्ति, सर्गः प्रतिसर्गः मन्वन्तराणि प्राचीनराजवंशावली तथा वंशावलीस्थव्यक्तीनां चरितं चेति। यद्यपि—वर्तमानकाले उपलब्धेषु पुराणेषु यत्किमपि पुराणमेतस्याः परिभाषाया अक्षरशोऽनुसरणं न करोति, तथाप्यनेकेषु पुराणेष्विमानि पञ्चलक्षणानि बीजरूपेण सुरक्षितानि सन्तीति—

(घोषाल, स्टडीज् इन इण्डियन हिस्ट्री एण्ड कल्चर, पृ० ५१)

अत्र ब्रूमः-

"सृष्टिप्रवृत्तिसंहारधर्ममोक्षप्रयोजनम् ।
ब्रह्मभिर्विविधैः प्रोक्तं पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥" (कौटि० १-५, व्याख्या)

इत्यर्थशास्त्रजयमङ्गलोद्धृतस्य पूर्वोक्तवचनस्यामरकोशकर्तृसमकालिककौटिल्यकृतार्थशास्त्रीयपुराणपदार्थप्रतिपादकस्य तत्पूर्वतनव्याख्यापरम्परागतस्योपलभ्यमानत्वेनामरकोशगतपञ्चलक्षणपदस्यापि तादृशार्थपरत्वे नास्त्येव शङ्कावकाशः ।

"सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।"

इति वाक्यस्यापि "मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्म" इति वचनप्रामाण्येन तादृशार्थप्रतिपादकत्वमिति स्फुटं प्रतीयते । स्पष्टीकृतोऽयमर्थ उपक्रमे एवास्माभिः ।

एवं सति ह्याधुनिकैरितिहाससंशोधकैः राजनीतिशास्त्रस्यापर्यालोचनेनासूययेव कृता एते सर्वेऽप्याक्षेपा अश्रद्धेया एव ।

तथाहिः—यदुच्यते—आख्यानम्, उपाख्यानम्, गाथा, कल्पोक्तिश्चेति चतुष्टयमेवैतेषां पञ्चलक्षणानां मूलमिति, तत्र पुराणस्थानामाख्यानादीनां मूलत्वमपेक्षितं वा वेदादिस्थानामाख्यानानामिति प्रथममालोचनीयतामर्हति । आद्यपक्षे स्फुट एवात्माश्रयदोषः । द्वितीयपक्षस्तु इष्यत एव ।

"यद्ब्राह्मणानीतिहासान् पुराणानि कल्पा गाथानाराशंसी"रिति

(तै० आ० २-६ अ०)

वेदवाक्यं भाष्यकृता एवं व्याख्यातम् ।

"इतिहासा महाभारतादयः, पुराणानि ब्रह्माण्डादीनि, यद्वा "देवासुरा, संयत्ता आस"न्नित्यादय इतिहासा, "आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीन्नान्यत्किञ्चन मिष"दिति सृष्ट्यादिप्रतिपादकानि पुराणानि । कल्पा, कल्पसूत्राणि प्रयोगप्रतिपादकानि, गाथाः—गायतिचोदिता मन्त्रविशेषाः "योऽस्यकोष्ठ्ये"त्यादयः, यमगाथाभिः परिगायतीति विधानात् । नराशंसशब्दोपेता नाराशंस्यः "होतायक्षन्नराशंस"मित्याद्याः मन्त्रब्राह्मणान्तःपठितानामपि पुनरुक्तिः फलातिशयद्योतनार्थमिति ।

अत्र हि पुराणशब्दस्य व्याख्यायां सृष्ट्यादिप्रतिपादकानीति वदता भाष्यकृता "सृष्टिप्रवृत्ती"ति पूर्वोद्धृतजयमङ्गलोक्तवचनमेव समर्थते राजनीतिगत-

त्वात् । "सर्गश्चे" त्यादिवचनस्य स्मरणे सति सर्गादिप्रतिपादकानीत्येवोच्येतेति विशेषः स्फुटः ।

कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रेऽपि—"पश्चिममितिहासश्रवणेषु पुराणमितिवृत्तमाख्यायिकोदाहरणं धर्मशास्त्रमर्थशास्त्रंचेतिहासाः" इति ।

अत्र भारतीभवनप्रकाशितेऽर्थशास्त्रे कौटिलीये आख्यायिकोदाहरणम्—

"असम्भूतकथावाक्यमुक्तप्रत्युत्तरान्वितम् ।
निदर्शनार्थमन्येषामुदाहरणमिष्यते ॥"

यथा तन्त्रपञ्चकादि । इति प्राचीनटिप्पणमुद्धृतं दृश्यते ।

जयमङ्गलाकृतापि आख्यायिकोदाहरणं "वर्जनसेवनफलं तन्त्राख्यायिकादि ।" इत्यादि वदता उक्तटिप्पणस्यैवार्थोऽनुमोदितः ।

एवंविधानामाख्यायिकानां पुराणमूलत्वमितिहासमूलत्वं चोदाहरणरूपत्वेनैव भवतीति स्पष्टोऽर्थः । पूर्वोक्तपुराणलक्षणप्रतिपादके "सृष्टिप्रवृत्ती" त्यादिवचने स्थितिपर्यायायाः प्रवृत्तेरपि प्रतिपाद्यत्वावगमाज्जगत्परिपालनविषया अन्ये सर्वेऽपि धातुवादादयः पुराणेतिहासान्तर्गता भवन्ति । स्त्रीशूद्रादिसर्वसाधारणेषु श्राव्यत्वोपयुक्तया रचनया तर्हि महदुपकृतं पुराणैर्लोकस्येति स्थितौ सत्यां तदुपरि संशयगर्भिताया दृष्टेर्निक्षेपणं त्वसूयाकल्पितमिव भवति ।

एतेन "वंशानुचरित"मित्यत्र "भूम्यादेः संस्थान"मिति पाठान्तरं वर्णयित्वा आक्षेपोद्भावनमप्ययुक्तमेव । लोकोपयुक्तस्य सर्वस्यैवज्ञानस्य पूर्वोक्तरीत्या पुराणेन वर्णनीयत्वे सिद्धे ज्ञानकोशरूपेषु पुराणेषु सर्वस्यैवांशस्यावकाशसत्त्वादुभयोरेव पाठयोः प्रामाण्योपपत्तेः । भागवतोक्तदशलक्षणान्यपि पूर्वोक्तपञ्चलक्षणाविरोधीन्येव । न ह्येकस्मिन् लक्षणे स्थितेऽन्यानि लक्षणानि न सम्भवन्तीति कश्चन नियमः । न्यायशास्त्रे—

"वर्णः शुक्लो रसस्पर्शौ जले मधुरशीतलौ ।
स्नेहस्तत्र द्रवत्वं तु सांसिद्धिकमुदाहृतम् ॥" (भाषाप० ३९)

इत्यादिना बहूनां लक्षणानां वर्ण्यमानत्वस्य दर्शनात् ।

प्रयोजनं हि बहूनां लक्षणानां, सर्वत्र सर्वेषां लक्षणानामप्राप्तावपि केनचिदेकेनापि लक्ष्यनिर्णयः। तथा पञ्चलक्षणैर्दशलक्षणैर्वा का नामानुपपत्तिर्निष्प्रयोजनता वेति नैव वक्तुं शक्यम्। दशलक्षणवर्जितानामपि पुराणत्वख्यापनाय पञ्चलक्षणस्यावश्यकत्वात्।

अत्रेदमवधेयम्:—राजनीतिशास्त्रं प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणत्रयनिर्णीतार्थप्रतिपादकमिति पूर्वमेव ('पुराणम्' पत्रिका, भाग ३, अंक १, पृष्ठ ७२-९१ स्थले) प्रतिपादितम्। राजप्रकृतिसमवेततयैव कार्यकारित्वाद्राजनिर्णयरूपमेव तदिति दृढनिर्णयेन वक्तुं शक्यते। एवं सति न्यायालयनिर्णयतुल्ययोगक्षेमेषु राजनीतिसिद्धान्तेषु सर्वैः शिष्टैरेकवाक्यतया परिगृहीतेषु सत्सु तानदृष्ट्वा इतिहासंशोधनं विशेषतः प्राचीनवाक्येषु पुराणादिषु शङ्काविष्करणं खेदायैव सहृदयानां भवति इति।

THE GEOGRAPHICAL TEXT OF THE PURĀṆAS
A FURTHER CRITICAL STUDY.

By

C. A Lewis.

(*Continued from Vol. IV, No. 1*)

[अयं लेखः 'पुराण' पत्रिकायाः पूर्वस्मिन्नङ्के (भाग ४, अंक १) प्रकाशितस्य श्री लैविस महोदयेन लिखितस्य पुराणभुवनकोशसम्बन्धिनो लेखस्यावशिष्टांशः। पुराणानां भुवनकोशप्रकरणेषु मध्यदेश - उत्तरापथ-प्राच्य-दक्षिणापथ-अपरान्त - विन्ध्य - हिमालय - वर्त्तिना सप्तानां जनपदानां वर्णनमुपलभ्यते। तत्र पूर्वस्मिन्नङ्के प्रकाशिते लेखांशे आद्यानां त्रयाणां — मध्यदेश-उत्तरापथ-प्राच्य-वर्त्तिनां — जनपदानां पुराणकृतं वर्णनं समालोचितम्। पूर्वतोऽनुवृत्तेऽस्मिन्नंशे च शेषाणां चतुर्णां — दक्षिणापथ-अपरान्त-विन्ध्य-हिमालय-वर्त्तिनां — जनपदानां वर्णनं समीक्षितम्। पूर्ववदेव चात्रापि किरफिलमहोदयेन निर्णीतस्य पाठस्य दिनेशचन्द्रसरकारमहोदयेन च स्वीकृतस्य पाठस्य समालोचनां विधाय एषां जनपदानां स्थित्यादिविषये सम्भावितशुद्धपाठस्य च विषये युक्तिपुरःसरं स्वमतमपि प्रदर्शितम्।]

Dakṣiṇāpatha

Kirfel's text.

athāpare janapadā Dakṣiṇāpathavāsinaḥ
Pāṇḍyāś ca Keralāś caiva Colāḥ Kulyās tathaiva ca
Setukā Mūṣikāś caiva Kumanā Vanavāsikāḥ
Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣikāḥ Kaliṅgāś caiva sarvaśaḥ
Ābhīrāś ca Sahaiṣikā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarās tathā
Pulindā Vindhyamaulīyā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
Paurikā Maulikāś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ
Nairṇikāḥ Kuntalāś Āndhrā Udbhidā Nalakālikāḥ
dākṣiṇātyāś ca vai deśā............

Sircar's text.

athāpare janapadā dakṣiṇāpathavāsinaḥ
Pāṇḍyāś ca Keralāś caiva Colāḥ Kulyās tathaiva ca

Setukā Mūṣikāś caiva Kumārā Vanavāsakāḥ
Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣakāḥ Kaliṅgāś caiva sarvaśaḥ
Kāverāḥ saha Caiṣīkā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarāś ca ye
Pulindā Vindhyamūlīkā (yā) Vidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
Paurikā Maulikā (Maulakā)-ś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ
Nai (Ṛ-) ṣikāḥ Kuntalā Āndhrā Udbhidā Nalakālikāḥ (-lūpāḥ)
dākṣiṇātyāś ca vai deśā............

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

(1) K. Kumana. S. Kumāra; (2) K. Vanavāsika. S. Vanavāsaka; (3) K. Ābhīra. S. Kāvera; (4) K. Sahaiṣīka. S. Caiṣīka; (5) K. Vindhyamaulīya. S. Vindhyamūlīka (ya); (6) K. Maulika. S. ? Maulaka; (7) K. Nairṇika. S. Naiṣika / ? Ṛṣika; (8) K. Nalakālika S. ? Nalakālūpa. Of these nos. 2, and 5, are obviously variants of the same name and accordingly do not require further discussion. Kirfel's forms seem preferable in both cases.

(1) Kumana / Kumāra. Sircar's text is almost certainly correct, for the Kumāras may be easily identified with the inhabitants of Cape Comorin at the extreme southernmost tip of India. Such an identification would exactly suit the area required by the two preceding names, Setuka (Adam's Bridge) and Mūṣika (the southern part of the Malabar coast). Kirfel in his Bhāratavarṣa originally also adopted the form, Kumāra.

(3) Ābhīra / Kāvera. The problem here in determining the original name is rather an unusual one; in this instance both names are well established by numerous other texts, so that the usual bogy of textual corruption does not arise. Moreover as both the Abhīras and the Kāveras are definitely to be included in the Southern Region, a choice between the two is extremely difficult to make. The former were originally a N-W tribe between the Indus and the Sarasvatī, and were closely associated with the Śūdras. By the first century A. D. however,

they had migrated further south to the area of Gujarat around the mouth of the Narmadā. Ptolemy and the Periplus refer to this region by the name of Aberia. The Bṛhatsaṁhitā clearly indicates that the Ābhīras had two branches, one in the S-W and one in the South, which is associated with the Konkaṇas. The Kāśyapa Saṁhitā also confirms their location in the South. The Kāveras must of course be identified with the inhabitants of the banks of the Kāverī River, whose location in the South is obvious. There is accordingly abundant evidence for the location of both in Dakṣiṇāpatha. The only way therefore of determining the question is to consider the position of the other tribes mentioned in the same line. These are the Mahārāṣṭras (mod. Marāṭha country between the upper Godāvarī and Kṛṣṇā rivers), the Māhiṣikas, the inhabitants of the area around Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhāta on the Narmadā), Kaliṅgas (mod. Puri and Ganjam Dists. of Orissa), Āṭavyas and Śabaras (mod. Saurs of Ganjam Dist.). Among these tribes it is far easier to place the Ābhīras of Southern Gujarat than the Kāveras of the extreme south. It is evident that the extreme south has already been described in the opening ślokas from Pāṇḍya to Vanavāsī; now it is the northern areas of Dakṣiṇāpatha which are being described. Accordingly, Ābhīra seems the preferable reading.

(4) Sahaiṣīka/Caiṣīka. Both Kirfel's and Sircars's readings, though different in form, refer to a tribe called the Eṣīka, the former compounding it with saha and the latter with ca. The most valuable evidence in helping one to determine the original text at this point is supplied by the Vaijayantī, which mentions the Iṣīkas as a tribe of Dakṣiṇāpatha along with the Śabarāraṭṭas. That this section is a direct quotation from a Purāṇic source may be proved from its striking similarity with the actual texts now under discussion. Compare :

Vaij.	37·34.	Iṣīkāḥ Śabarāraṭṭāḥ
Vāyu.	45·126.	Caiṣīkā Āṭavyāḥ Śabara
Mats.	114·48.	Sahaiṣīkā Āṭavyāḥ Śabara
Mārk.	57·47.	Vaiśīkya Āḍhakyāḥ Śabara

The question now arises as to the identity of these Iṣīkas. This has been explained by Moti Chandra (J.U.P.H.S. Dec. 1943 p. 24) as a Prakrit form of Sanskrit Ṛṣīka. According to the same authority, both these forms are given as alternatives at MB. 2·24·23–4, where the northern digvijaya of Arjuna is being described. If this association is accepted, the next question that arises is whether the Ṛṣīkas are ever to be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. Independent evidence of such a location can be derived from the Kūrma-vibhāga[30] sections of the Bṛhat-saṁhitā and the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa and also from the Kiṣkin-dhā-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa. There is thus decisive evidence for two separate branches of Ṛṣīkas, one in the North as indicated by the Mahā-bhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, and the other in the South, as proved by the Purāṇic texts, the Kūrma-vibhāga list and the Rāmāyaṇa. Accordingly the form Iṣīka (i.e. the Prakrit form of Ṛṣīka) is the reading to be adopted here.

(6) Maulika / ? Maulaka. Sircar's emendation to Maulaka is almost certainly correct. The mūlakas are well known for their close association with the Aśmakas who later absorbed them. In the Nasik record of queen Gautamī Balaśrī (EI. VIII. 61), mention is made of Asaka (i. e. Aśmaka) immediately before Mūlaka, while Purāṇic traditions attribute the foundation of these two kingdoms to Ikṣvāku chiefs.

(7) Nairṇika / Naiṣika ? Ṛṣika. The original reading here is very uncertain. The corresponding texts of the geogra-phical section of the Mahā-bhārata includes the variants Jhillika, Nillika, Kuḍaya and Karnīka, while the Brahmāṇḍa and[31] Brahma-purāṇas read Nestika and Kaulika respectively. None of these forms provides any immediate solution to the difficulty however. At first sight the most plausible reading is Naiṣika, which one is at once tempted to identify with modern Nasik. As long as we limit our investigation to the peoples of Dakṣiṇāpatha, this appears to be a probable solution, for Nasik in located in the south by both Rājaśekhara and the

30. BS. XIV. 15, Mārk, 58.27 ; R. Kiṣ (B). 41.10. (N.W.) 33.12.

31. Bḍ. 1. 16. 59, Br. 27, 57.

Kūrma-vibhāga texts. There is one major obstacle to such an identification however. If, we examine, as we shortly will, the Purāṇic lists of Aparānta peoples, we find among them the Nāsikyas, who are associated with the Antara-or Uttara-Narmadas, the Bharukacchas (i. e. the inhabitants of mod. Baroach), and the Māheyas (the peoples along the banks of the Mahī). As all these places are not far from Nasik, it would seem preferable to include Nāsikya in Aparānta-deśa rather than in Dakṣiṇāpatha, though in actual fact the position of Nasik is so ambiguous geographically that it may easily be incorporated into either region by a slight change of the boundary line separating them. This uncertainty is reflected in the Kūrma-vibhāga texts. While the Bṛhatsaṁhitā and the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa locate Nāsikya in the South, the Pariśiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda (LVI. 6) places it in the South-west. The environment in which it is placed by the latter text is of considerable significance as it corresponds to a great degree with the position assigned to Nāsikya in Aparānta-deśa by the Purāṇic texts. Compare :

Purāṇa—

Nāsikyādyāś ca ye cānye ye caivottaranarmadāḥ
Bhārukacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ...

Pariśiṣṭa—

Nāsikya-Karmanoyaṇi-Māhī-Narmadā...

Except for the interpolation of the unknown Karmanoyani in the Pariśiṣṭa text, the environment in both cases is identical. Accordingly, the location of Nāsikya in the western division is much more probable. Furthermore its inclusion in Dakṣiṇāpatha by Rājaśekhara[32] and the Kūrma-vibhāga lists can be easily explained by an analysis of the structure of these texts. Rājaśekhara distinctly specifies that Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhāta on an island in the Narmadā) is to be regarded as the southern boundary of Madhya-deśa. As Nasik is south of the Narmadā, it must automatically be included in the southern region. Bharukaccha (mod. Baraoch) is not, and accordingly has been assigned by Rājaśekhara to the western division. Similarly

32. KM. p. 93, BS. XIV. 13, Mārk. 58.. 24

the Dakṣiṇāpatha of the astronomical texts includes not only the entire area south of the Narmadā, but even some districts north of it like Bhārukaccha and Girinagara. Accordingly Both Bhārukaccha and Nāsikya are by their classification to be included in the southern division. In view of all the preceding evidence therefore, it is not possible to identify the Naiṣika of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa with Nasik, for the latter will be correctly included later on in the list of western peoples. It accordingly remains to discover some other alternative. Sircar, who is also evidently not satisfied with Naiṣika, suggests Ṛṣika as a possible reading, but if we accept the Vaijayantī's text, Iṣika, as correct, this alternative is no longer possible. A very hypothetical solution of this problem may be found in regarding Jhillika and Kaulika as corruptions of Śūlika. A people of this name has already been mentioned among the tribes of Uttarāpatha by these puranic[33] texts, and the Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa has actually listed Jhillika as a variant. As the Kūrma-vibhāga texts actually refer to a second branch of Śūlikas in the South-east, and several manuscripts of the geographical catalogue of the Mahā-bhārata cite a form Vindhya-cūlika, evidence from independent sources does exist for assuming the existence of a second branch of Śūlikas in this division.

(8) Nalakālīka/ ? Nalakālūpa. The reading once again is uncertain as none of the purāṇic variants contributes anything of value. The parallel passage of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.58.) includes the variants, Nalakālaka, Nalakānana and Nabhakānana, none of which occurs elsewhere. The Vaijayantī includes in its text of Southern peoples a tribe called the Kulakālakas. This name must be parallel to the Nalakālikas etc. of the purāṇas. Moreover in the Kūrma-vibhāga section of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa we find a people called the Kakulālakas who are associated with the Niṣādas and the Parṇa-śabaras. Its form at once suggests that it is identical with the Kulakālakas of the Vaijayantī, which, as has already been indicated, corresponds to the Nalakālika etc. of the Epic and Purāṇic texts.

33. Kirfel. Bhāratavarṣa. p. 45. Br. Mk. Vā. Śūlika, Bd. Jhillika, Vām. Kulūta.

Sircar's suggestion that the reading Nalakālūpa i. e. the Nalas and Alūpas, two dynasties of the Deccan should be adopted, though plausible, is not supported by any direct evidence.

Before we complete our analysis of the list of Dakṣiṇāpatha tribes, one further textual point remains to be discussed. Both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading Kūlya after Cola in the opening line of these texts. While the Colas are well known however, the Kūlyas are very obscure and perhaps only owe their place in the text to textual corruption. Law (A. B. O. R. I. 1936 pp. 217ff.) connects them with the Kolas of the Mahābhārata, who in turn may be connected with Kollagiri whose location in the south is established by the Mahā-bhārata[34] and the Kūrma-vibhāga texts. Some support for preferring Kola to the unknown Kūlya is supplied by the latter which place Kollagiri and Cola next to one another. The Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa variant, Golāṅgula, is very interesting; it can scarcely be a corruption, as Pargiter maintained, as the same name occurs in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā (XVI. 3.) along with the Puṇḍras, Śrīparvatas, and Vardhamānas. As this list is an astronomical and not a geographical one however, no conclusion can be derived from it regarding the location of the Gol'ṅgulas.

Our survey of Dakṣiṇāpatha tribes now being complete, we may summarise our results in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names denote new readings ; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

Paṇḍyāś ca Keralāś caiva Colāḥ Kolās tathaiva ca
Setukā Muṣikāś caiva Kumārā Vanavāsikāḥ

Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣikāḥ Kaliṅgāś caiva sarvaśaḥ
Ābhīrāś ca sahEṣīkā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarās tathā

Pulindā Vindhyamūlīyā Vidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
Paurikā Maulakāś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ

Śūlikā Kuntalāś cAndhrā Udbhidā Nalakālikāḥ

34. MB. 2.28.45, BS. XIV. Markp. 58.23.

It now remains to identify briefly the above and so confirm their location in Dakṣiṇāpatha.

1. Pāṇḍya. Mod. Tinnevelly Dist. Capital Mathurā (mod. Madura). They are the Pandiones of Ptolemy.

2. Kerala. Mod. Malabar and Travancore–Cochin Dists.

3. Cola. Mod. Tanjore and Trichinopoly Dists. Capital Uraiyur (Skt. Uragapura) which corresponds to mod. Old Trichinopoly. They are the Sora of Ptolemy.

4. Kola. If this reading is accepted, the Kolas may be regarded as the inhabitants of Kolla giri, According to the Mahā-bhārata (2.28.45) it was conquered by Sahadeva along with Mūracīpaṭṭanam (i. e. the Mouziris of the Greeks and mod. Muyirikkodu). In both the Kūrma-vibhāga texts it is placed next to the Colas, but Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṁsā locates it several places away between Kauṅkaṇa and Vallara. Its identification is accordingly somewhat uncertain. Dey identifies it with Kodagu i. e. Coorg on the Malabar coast, while Law locates it at Kolhapur on the basis of epigraphic evidence (E. I. III. 207; XXIII. 30), which refers to a town of Kollapura. Kollagiri and Kollapura however need not necessarily be the same, and if Mūracīpaṭṭanam is mod. Muyirikkodu, Coorg, judging from the evidence of Sahadeva's digvijaya, is a rather more probable location than Kolhapur.

5. Setuka. The inhabitants of the Setu-bandha, i. e. Adam's Bridge, a chain of islets linking India with Ceylon.

6. Mūṣika. There appears to have been two tribes of this or similar name. One may be located in the extreme south on the Malabar coast between Quilon and Cape Comorin, and a second further north, which is referred to in the Kūrma-vibhāga section of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa as Mṛṣīka and placed in the South-east division. Pargiter locates the latter on the river Musi on which stands mod. Hyderabad. The geographical section of the Mahā-bhārata refers to them both. The mention of the Setukas and the Kumāras shows that it

is the Mūṣikas of the far south to whom reference is being made in the present context.

7. Kumāra. The inhabitants of Cape Comorin, the southernmost tip of India.

8. Vanavāsika. The inhabitants of the Kannada speaking areas between the Ghats, the Tuṅgabhadrā and the Wardhā rivers. The ancient name of this region is preserved by the modern town of Banavasi situated on the left bank of the Wardhā.

9. Mahārāṣṭra. The mod. Maratha region. The extent of this well known territory varied from time to time, but its heart may be located in the area between the Upper Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā·

10. Māhiṣaka. The inhabitants of the Narmadā valley around Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhātā on an island in that river).

11. Kaliṅga. The extent of this large and important kingdom varied from time to time according to different political conditions. In Epic times it is most frequently associated with the Aṅgas and Vaṅgas, and this has led to suggestions that at this period it did not extend south-west of Orissa. Abundant epigraphic[35] evidence however shows that the Kaliṅga country extended along the east coast from the Mahānadī to the Godāvarī rivers.

12. Ābhīra. As mentioned previously, the Ābhīras were originally a North-west people, who by the second century A. D. occupied the areas of mod. Gujarat near the mouth of the Narmadā.

13. Iṣīka. The region occupied by this people cannot be determined with certainty. In the geographical catalogue of the Mahā-bhārata they are associated with the Vidarbhas, and in the Rāmāyaṇa with the Vidarbhas and the Māhiṣakas. They may thus be located in the upper section of the Narmada valley.

35. For full details of the epigraphic evidence see Chaudhuri, pp. 71-80.

14. Āṭavya, According to epigraphic evidence (C.I.I. III. 114; E. I. VIII. 284-7) they are to be closely associated with the Ḍahālas or Cedis and so may be located in the Jubbulpur Dist.

15. Śabara. The Sabarai of Ptolemy and the descendants of the mod. Saurs who occupy the Ganjam Dist. of Orissa. The Bṛhatsaṁhitā divided them into two groups, the Nagna-śabaras and the Parṇa-śabaras. The former must refer to those Śabaras, who did not wear any type of clothing, while for the latter, two possibilities have been put forward; firstly the Parṇa-śabaras may be interpreted as denoting those Śabaras, who used leaves as their food as Pargiter maintains, or alternatively those members of the tribe who used leaves as clothing. The latter suggestion is much more suited to the context, for then the sense of the whole passage becomes "the Śabaras who wear clothes and those who do not." This distinction has doubtless been specifically made in the Karma-vibhāga texts to indicate differences in the stages of civilisation and culture among the various branches of Śabara. The Parṇa-śabaras are probably the Phullitai of Ptolemy (Gk. phullon leaf). and may be identified with the modern Juangs[36] of Keonjhar Dist. of Orissa, who even now wear leaves.

16. Pulinda. The Poulindoi Agriophagoi of Ptolemy. Their antiquity is proved by the fact that they are associated in the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa (VII. 18. 2.) with the Śabaras and the Āndhras. According to Raychaudhuri (PHAI. p. 258.) their capital, Pulinda-nagara, is to be located at Rupnath to the East of Bhilsa.

17. Vidarbha. mod. Berar. Capitals Kuṇḍinapura (mod. Kundinyapura on the Wardhā in the Chandur taluk of Amraoti Dist.) and Bhojakaṭa (mod. Bhojapura 6 miles S–E of Bhilsa.).

18. Daṇḍaka. The inhabitants of the forest tracts between Bundelkhand and the Kṛṣṇā. Raychaudhuri (PHAI. 5th ed. p. 91.) would locate their capital at Kumbhāvatī.

36. Ptol. VII. 1. 66. B. S. O. A. S. XIV. p, 85. Vogel, Notes on Ptolemy. Elwin. Notes on the Juang (Man in India, Vol. 28. p. 1).

19. Paurika. The inhabitants of the city of Purikā, which according to the evidence of the Hari-vaṁśa (2.38. 20-22) was situated not far from Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhātā) in the Ṛkṣa mountains.

20. Maulaka. The extremely close association of the Mūlakas with the more powerful Aśmakas causes some difficulty in determining their geographical location. According to Buddhist Sanskrit[37] tradition the Godāvarī formed the original boundary between the two peoples, the Mūlakas occupying the northern bank, and the Aśmakas the south.

21. Aśmaka. At the time of the composition of these purāṇic texts the Aśmakas must have occupied the southern bank of the Godāvarī immediately below Pratiṣṭhāna (mod. Paithan). Such a location is indicated by the separate mention of Mūlaka and Aśmaka. Later on however, they extended northwards across the river and, absorbing their neighbours, the Mūlakas, occupied the modern Nasik and Aurangabad districts.

22. Bhogavardhana. Epigraphic evidence (EI. IX. 299) indicates that Bhogavardhana is to be identified with mod. Bhokardhan, the north-eastern taluk of Aurangabad district.

23. Śūlika. If this reading is accepted, these Śūlikas may be identified with the tribe of the same name mentioned in the Harāha inscription of Īśānavarman (A. D. 554). In this inscription the Śūlikas are mentioned between the Āndhras and the Gauḍas, and so are evidently to be located in Orissa, as the names are set in geographical order from south to north. Other records of the Śūlikas have also been found in the same area. Law would identify them with the Solaki of Gujarat or the Cālukyas, but both these suggestions which rest on similarity of form seem somewhat dubious.

---

37. Law. Geography of Early Buddhism p. 21. The text of the Sutta-Nipāta (V. 977) implies that the Brahmin priest reached the Mūlaka country proceeding northwards from Assaka (Aśmaka) which lay along the southern bank of the Godāvarī in Dakṣiṇāpatha.

24. Kuntala. Epigraphic evidence indicates that the Kuntalas occupied a considerable area between the Bhīmā and Vedavatī rivers, and so included most of the modern Kannada speaking regions. Capital Kalyāṇapura (mod. Kalyana 36 miles west of Bidar).

25. Āndhra. The inhabitants of the modern Telugu speaking area on the east coast of India between the Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā rivers. Whether the Āndhras originally inhabited this region or migrated there from an earlier abode in the Vindhyas is uncertain. Some evidence in favour of the latter contention is supplied by the connection of the Āndhras with the Aśmakas in Buddhist[38] texts and their association with the Pulindas at the time of the composition of the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa. Also in the present day in the Amraoti district lives a tribe of Andhs, who may well be the descendants of the ancient Āndhras. Their importance at the time of Alexander is attested by Pliny who, following Megasthenes, states that they possessed thirty fortified towns and a vast army. (N.H. 6. 22).

26. Udbhida. This name so far remains unidentified.

27. Nalakālika. The location of this tribe is quite uncertain. Dey would connect them with the Nelcynda of Ptolemy (mod Kottayam in Travancore). Shafer (EAI. p 75), on account of their proximity with the Andhras, locates them along the Kistnā river and Nallamalai mountains. Both identifications are only conjectures, though the latter is certainly much more in conformity with the available data than the former.

APARĀNTA-DEŚA

Kirfel's text.

Śūrpārakāḥ Kalivanā Durgāḥ Kālitakaiḥ saha
Puleyāś ca Sirālāś ca Rūpasās Tāpasaiḥ saha
tathā Taittirikāś caiva sarve caiva Kār[39]askarāḥ
Nāsikyāś caiva ye cānye ye caiv Āntaranarmadāḥ

38. Malalasekhara. Dict. of Pali Proper Names. I. p. 109.

39. Scansion here requires an obligatory short syllable.

Bhārukacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sārasvatair api
Kacchīyāś ca Surāṣṭrāś ca Ānartāś cĀrbudaiḥ saha

Sircar's text.

Śūrpārakāḥ Kolavanā Durgās Tālikaṭaiḥ saha
Puleyāś ca Surā (Murā ?) lāś ca Rūpasās Tāmasaiḥ saha
tathā tu Raminās caiva sarve caiva Kār[30]askarāḥ
Nāsikyādyāś ca ye cānye ye caivOttaranarmadāḥ
Bhāru (Bhṛgu)-kacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sārasvatair api
Kacchīyāś ca Surāṣṭrāś ca Ānartāś cĀrbudaiḥ saha

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations. (1) K. Kalivana. S. Kolavana; (2) K. Kālitaka. S. Tālikaṭa; (3) K. Sirāla. S. Surāla. ? Murāla; (4) K. Tāpasa. S. Tāmasa; (5) K. Taittirika. S. tu Raminas; (6) K. Antaranarmada. S. Uttaranarmada; (7) K. Bhārukaccha. S. Bhāru (Bhṛgu) kaccha. Of these no. 7. is merely a question of whether one should adopt the Prakrit or Sanskrit form for Baraoch and accordingly does not require further discussion.

(1) Kalivana / Kolavana. Epigraphic evidence supplies the clue to the correct reading in this case. In two grants of Pṛthivīcandra Bhogaśakti, a member of the Hariścandra dynasty, who ruled in the seventh and early eighth centuries A.D. an area roughly comprising modern Nasik district as the feudatory vassal of the Western Calukyas (EI. XXV. 230), we find a reference to the town of Kallivana, which corresponds exactly to Kirfel's reading, Kalivana. This may easily be identified with mod. Kalvan in the north-west region of Nasik district.

(2) Kālitaka / Tālikaṭa. The accuracy of Sircar's form, Tālikaṭa, is proved by the Kūrma-vibhāga texts which locate it in the South. The apparent difference of direction however need cause no difficulty for, as previously mentioned, the boundaries adopted by the compilers of the various texts are useful for that one system of classification only, so that, what one source might include in the West, another would place in the South. Kirfel's form, Kālitaka, can easily be explained

as a confusion of the original name due to carelessness in transcription. Tāiikaṭa is also mentioned as a variant reading in the digvijaya of Sahadeva, where the Poona Critical[40] Edition reads Copakṛta which however must be almost certainly wrong. In this passage also Tālikaṭa is mentioned close to Śūrpāraka and so the accuracy of the puranic lists is confirmed by an independent source.

(3) Sirāla / Surāla ? Muṛāla. The text here is very doubtful, as none of the variants listed by the different Purāṇas can be traced in other sources. This has led Sircar to conjecture that the form, Surāla, is an error for Muṛāla. Such an hypothesis at first sight has much to recommend it; Devanāgarī s and m by reason of their close similarity are constantly confused in orthography, while the existence of a tribe called the Murālas who lived on the banks of a river of the same name, is proved by at least two independent sources, Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṁsā and Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṁśa. The former locates it in Dakṣiṇāpatha and places it between Kāvera and Vanavāsaka and accordingly implies that it is to be located in the far south, a position that is confirmed by the Raghuvaṁśa (IV. 55), which implies that the Murāla river was situated in or near Kerala. Sircar, following Dey, identifies the Murala with the Mūlamuthā which rises near Poona and is a tributary of the Bhīmā, but this appears to be too far north to be correct in view of the location implied by the Kāvya-mīmāṁsā and Raghu-vaṁśa. For the same reason therefore it is doubtful whether Surāla should be regarded as corrupt for Murāla. Shafer (EAI. p. 78) identifies the Sirālas with Sirel near Miraj in the Kolhapur district of Bombay. Such an identification can only depend on the similarity between the ancient and modern names, but the location would suit the requirements of the purāṇic texts.

(4) Tāpasa/Tāmasa. Kirfel's reading is the more probable. The Kūrmavibhāga mention in their lists of southern peoples

40. MB. 2 28 43 ; MSS. V_1 B_2 Dn_1 Tālākaṭa; $B_{3\,5}$ Dn_3 $D_{3\,5}$ Tālīkaṭa.

a name, Tāpasāśrama, with which Tāpasa may at once be connected. As we have seen before, the apparent difference in direction is no obstacle in associating the two names with each other. According to Dey, Tāpasāśrama may be identified as with mod. Panderpur or Pandharpur on the southern bank of the Bhīmā in Sholapur district. Sircar's reading. Tāmasa, appears very doubtful. It cannot refer to the Tāmasavana which must be located in the Panjab, not to the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tāmasā, i.e. mod. Tones, a branch of the Sarayū in Oudh, as neither of these places can possibly be located in the western division. Dey also lists two other Tāmasā rivers, one in Rewa and the other in Garhwal, but both of these would also be quite out of place.

(5) Taittirika/tu Ramina. The text at this point is very difficult to determine. In addition to the forms adopted by Kirfel and Sircar, the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa reads Kurumina (which Chaudhuri follows) and the Vāyu-purāṇa, Turasita. The most probable reading at a superficial glance would be Turasita, which at once suggests some connection with the Tārakṣiti of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts, where it is located in the tail of the "tortoise", i e. in the West. Unfortunately this is a far too easy solution, for a detailed analysis of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts at once shows that the 'West' of these texts does not correspond with our modern ideas of what would constitute western India, nor with those of the compiler of the Bhuvana-kośa texts, who clearly identifies it with the coastal portion of Bombay State on both sides of the Narbada. As the Tārakṣiti are associated with peoples like the Rāmaṭhas, Pāradas, Jṛingas, Vaiśyas etc. it is obvious that they have no place in the western region of the Bhuvana-kośa texts. For the same reason it is impossible to accept Chaudhuri's reading of Kurumina, which he tentatively identifies with Karmania or Kerman in Persia, In stressing that the Pāradas etc. have been included in the West, he shows that he has fundamentally failed to appreciate the completely different systems of classification employed by the compilers of the Bhuvana-kośa lists and the Kūrma-vibhāga texts.

Kirfel's reading, Taittirika, however seems rather more likely. A people called the Tittiras is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (6.46.50.) along with the Colas, Pāṇḍyas and Śabaras. Their association with these tribes would suggest that they are to be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. In the Mahābhārata however, this term is often used loosely of the entire area south of the Narmada, and so would necessarily include that part of purāṇic Aparānta-déśa which lay south of that river. This can be proved by using the next name in the text, Kāraskara, as an example. The purāṇic lists locate it with the Māhiṣakas, Kaliṅgas and Keralas, all of whom are placed by these same lists in the south. Accordingly, the association of the Taittiras with the Colas etc. is no serious obstacle to adopting Kirfel's text, which is based on the Matsya-purāṇa. The difficulty arises from the fact that the portion of Aparānta-déśa, which is south of the Narmadā in the purāṇic texts, is included by the Mahābhārata in Dakṣiṇāpatha; in other words the two areas overlap one another to some degree.

(6) Antaranarmada/Uttaranarmada. The difficulty here rests entirely with the meaning. Antaranarmada has been interpreted as referring to those tribes, who live within the basin of the Narmadā, while Uttaranarmada has been taken to denote those peoples who live on the northern bank of that river. Such is the translation suggested by Pargiter (Markp. (trans.) p. 339). It also however seems possible to interpret the compound Uttaranarmada as Bahuvrīhi "those having the Narmadā to their north" i. e. those tribes living to the south of the Narmadā, whose northern boundary is determined by that river. It is significant that all the names previously listed, where identification is possible, are to the south of the Narmadā:

Śūrpāraka (Sopara), Tālikaṭa (associated with Śūrpāraka and therefore south of the Narmadā), Kalivana (Kalvan), Tāpasa (Pandharpur), Taittirika and Kāraskara (in South according to Mahā-bhārata and therefore below Narmadā), Nāsikya (Nasik). Accordingly, if Uttaranarmada is interpreted in this sense, it is a distinctly preferable reading to Antaranarmada, which would

refer to the tribes living near the sources of the Narmadā, an area which would properly belong to the Vindhya division. Moreover further support is given to the reading, Uttaranarmada, by the fact that all the names in the next śloka are to be located north of the Narmadā. The Aparānta-deśa is accordingly extremely well defined ; it consists of an area on both sides of the Narmadā, which perhaps bisects it. In the first part of the text, only tribes to its south are enumerated, and in the second section, which starts with Bhārukaccha, only tribes to its north.

Before we complete our analysis of the list of western tribes, one further textual point is perhaps worthy of consideration. Both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading Puleya, while the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa reads Pulinda and the Matsya-purāṇa Kuliya. The Pulindas are of course very well known and are usually associated with the śabaras and located in the south. As it is not possible to confirm from any independent text that they should be included within the boundaries of Aparānta-deśa, the Mārkaṇḍeya text is accordingly very doubtful and probably is the result of a copyist's "effort" to "correct the passage" by substituting a well known name for what was to him at least an unknown one. The Matsya form, Kuliya, at once suggests that it may be connected with the Kūlyas, who have been mentioned already among the tribes of Madhya-deśa and Dakṣiṇāpatha. As nothing however is known about these Kūlyas from independent sources, their name may not be authentic but one which owes its existence to textual corruption. The one advantage in reading Puleya is that it is free from the difficulties present in Pulinda and Kūlya, namely that they have already been located in these texts in divisions other than Aparānta-deśa. Even so Puleya is a very doubtful form, for there is no evidence for its existence in any independent source which would confirm the accuracy of its form. The depth of corruption at this point of the text and the resulting confusion is clearly indicated by the corresponding section of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.62), where a vast number of variants are found, none of which contributes anything to the solution of the problem. The Critical Edition adopts the form 'Ādidāya', but the whole crux goes so deep that

thie reading can reflect nothing more than the subjective choice of the editor.

The following comments are made purely by way of suggestion only. Devanagari l and t are very similar in orthography. By changing l to t in Puleya we obtain a form Puteya, which is perhaps a metathesis of Tāpeya, i. e. the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tāpī (mod. Tapti). The context makes it clear that a location south of the Narmadā is essential to any reading.

A second serious difficulty in both Kirfel's and Sircar's texts, is the reading, Rūpasa. As Chaudhuri rightly says (p. 149 n17), "For the Rupasas there is hardly any reliable notice." It is therefore probable that the Rūpasas owe their existence to textual corruption. The corresponding text of the Mahābhārata (6. 10. 62.), where the editor of the Poona Critical Edition reads Stubaka, has a host of variants, of which the most interesting, Sūnapas, may well provide the key to the solution of this problem. It is clear that Sūpana and Rūpasa are jumbled forms of what must have originally been the same name, as both have every letter in common except r and n. The confusion here is doubtless due to the orthographical similarity between Devanagrī r and n. Most significantly however the Mahābhārata form, Sūpana, can be re-arranged by metathesis as Anūpas, which is the name of a very well known tribe in Sanskrit Literature. If we substitute Anūpas for Rūpasa in the purāṇic texts, it is accordingly necessary to locate them south of the Narmadā in Aparānta-deśa. The most definite passage for the Anūpas is to be found in the Raghuvaṁśa (VI. 37-43.), which states that Māhiṣmatī, on the Revā, was the capital of Anūpas. In the Nasik record of queen Gautamī Bālāśri they are placed between Aparānta and Vidarbha. The general conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that the Anūpas are to be located south of the Narmadā in Dakṣiṇāpatha rather than in Aparānta-ḍeṣa. This however would overlook the basic meaning of Anūpa

which is explained in the Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi as a tract of land near water, an example being Kaccha. In the Mahābhārata, Anūpa is mentioned as a coastal portion of the sea (sāgarānūpavāsinaḥ). Accordingly, if we locate the Anūpas on the southern bank of the Narmadā between Māndhātā and the sea, they may easily be included in Aparānta-deśa. Possibly at the time of the epics and purāṇas they occupied the coastal area to the south of the mouth of the Narmadā and later extended inland eastwards to Māhiṣmatī.

Our survey of the tribes of Aparānta-deśa now being complete, we may summarise our results in the form of a new text. As before, all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

South of Narmadā:

Śūrpārakāḥ Kalivanā Durgās Tālikaṭaiḥ saha

Tāpeyāś ca Sirālāś ca Anūpās Tāpasaiḥ saha

tathā Taittirikāś caiva sarve caiva Karaskarāḥ

Nāsikyādyāś ca ye cānye ye caivOttaranarmadāḥ

North of Narmadā:

Bhārukacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sārasvatair api
Kacchīyāś ca Surāṣṭrāś ca Ānartāś cArbudaiḥ saha

It now remains to identify the above briefly and so confirm their location in Aparānta-deśa.

1. Śūrpāraka. The Sopara of the Greeks. Mod. Sopara in Thana district, 37 miles north of Bombay, and 4 miles north-west of Bassim.

2. Kalivana. Mod. Kalvan in the north-west of Nasik district.

3. Durga. Their identity is uncertain. Dey lists a river Durgā as a tributary of the Sabarmatī in Gujarat, which would correspond roughly to the area required, but which is unfortunately to the north of the Narmadā, whereas all the names in this śloka must be located to its south. However it is nevertheless probable that the Durgas of this passage may be identified with the inhabitants of the banks of the Durgā river, for Dey's identification is probably wrong. According to the paurāṇic texts, the Durgā issued from the Ṛkṣa range, which may be identified with the modern Satpuras. Accordingly, the Durgā is to be placed to the south of the Narmadā.

4. Tālikaṭa. The generally accepted identification of this name with Talakāḍu or Talkaḍ, the capital or the Gaṅgas on the Kāverī 30 miles east of Mysore is very improbable, for Talkaḍ is so far south that it can only be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. The evidence of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas makes it clear that the Tālikaṭas must be located somewhere near Bombay.

(5) Tāpeya. If this suggestion is accepted, the Tāpeyas are obviously to be identified with the inhabitants along the banks of the river Tapti.

(6) Sirāla. Perhaps Shirol near Miraj (Kolhapur district)

(7) Anūpa. If this reading is accepted, the Ānūpas are to be located on the coast immediately to the south of the mouth of the Narmadā. Later they extended their influence inland as far as Māndhātā.

(8) Tāpasa. Mod. Pandharpur on the Bhīmā.

(9) Taitirrika. South of the Narmadā, but it is not possible to suggest a more precise location.

(10) Karaskara. Dey would locate them at Karakal in South Kanara district.

(11) Nāsikya. Mod. Nasik.

(12) Uttaranarmada. The tribes living on the south bank of the Narmadā whose northern boundary is formed by that river.

(13) Bharukaccha. Mod. Baroach, 30 miles from the sea on the north side of the Narmadā. A town of great commercial importance, it was known to the Greeks as Barygaza.

(14) Māheya. The inhabitants of the bank of the river Māhī, which flows through Malwa into the Gulf of Cambay north of the Narmadā.

(15) Sārasvata. The inhabitants of the bank of the river Sarasvatī, which, rising in Mt. Abu, flows into the sea near Prabhāsa (mod. Somanath). Sircar erroneously connects it with the river Sarsuti, which must be located in the north.

(16) Kacchīya. The water-logged portions of the sea-coast from the Gulf of Cambay to Baroach.

(17) Surāṣṭra. The Syrastrene of the Periplus and Ptolemy. The Surāṣṭras occupied the lower half of the peninsula of Kathiawar around Junagadh, Their name survives in modern Surat.

(18) Ānarta. The Halar division of Kathiawar. Capitals Kuśasthālī (mod. Dvārkā) and Ānarttapura, later called Ānandapura (mod. Vadnagar).

(19) Arbuda. The inhabitants of Mt. Abu in the Aravalli range in the Sirohi State of Rajputana, a hill of great religious sanctity to the Jains.

VINDHYAN REGION

Kirfel's text

Mālavāś ca Karūṣāś ca Mekalāś cOtkalaiḥ saha
Uttamārṇā Daśārṇāś ca Bhojāḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha
Tośalāḥ Kośalāś caiva Traipurā Vaidiśās tathā
Tumurās Tumbarāś caiva Ṣaṭpurā Naiṣadhaiḥ saha
Anūpās Tuṇḍikerāś ca Vītihotrā hy Avantayaḥ

Sircar's text

Maladāś ca Karūṣāś ca Mekalāś cOtkalaiḥ saha
Uttamārṇā Daśārṇāś ca Bhojāḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha
Tośalāḥ Kośalāś caiva Traipurā Vaidiśās tathā

Tumurās Tumburāś caiva (? Tumbānās Tumbavanāś
ca) Paṭavo Niṣadhaiḥ saha
Anūpās Tuṇḍikerāś ca Vītihotrā Avantayaḥ

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

(1) K. Mālava. S. Malada ; (2) K. Tumura Tumbara. S. ? Tumbāna Tumbavana.(3) K. Ṣaṭpura. S. Paṭu.

(1) Mālava/Malada. The Mālavas are a very well known[41] tribe in ancient Indian history. Originally they lived in the north-west and are identified by most scholars with the Malloi of the Greeks, who made such a tenacious resistance to Alexander. The Mālavas in the present text are generally located in modern Malwa, a view however which ignores several important considerations. Firstly there is a serious chronological difficulty, as the Mālavas did not occupy the area of western Malwa until at least the sixth century A.D. Until that date Avantī was known by its own name; only from the sixth century A.D. did it become known as Mālava, the earliest reference to the arrival of the Mālavas in the vicinity of Ujjayinī, the Avantī capital, being made in Bāṇa's Kādambarī (ed. Ridding p. 221). As the Bhuvana-kośa lists must have been composed before that date, the Mālavas could not have been anywhere near Malwa. Numismatic evidence indicates that from the second to the fourth century A. D., they lived in the area of Jaipur, where large numbers of their coins have been found. Later they appear to have migrated further south to the areas of Mewar and Kotah.

Apart from chronological factors, there are sound textual reasons for doubting the authenticity of Mālava as the original reading. If we accept Mālava as an integral part of the text, there would be no reason for the inclusion of Avanti, as according to the lexicographers the two names are synonymous. Even more decisive is the evidence of the Vaijayantī, which includes the Maladas at the head of its Vindhya section—'atheme Maladādyākhyā Vindhyaparyantavāsinaḥ.' The same

41. For the latest detailed study see IHQ. 24. p. 171 ff.

work continues by identifying the Maladas with the Sthauras and the Karūṣas with the Bṛhadgṛhas. For these considerations also Malava is an unlikely reading.

Finally a comparison of the environment in which the Maladas or Mālavas are to be located brings one to the same conclusion. The other tribes mentioned in the same line are the Karūṣas, Mekalas and Utkalas. Of these the Mekalas may be identified with the inhabitants of the modern Maikal range, and the Utkalas with those of the interior of Orissa. Even more important however is the location of the Karūṣas. A tradition recorded in the Rāmāyaṇa (I. 14) groups the Karūṣas and the Maladas together, and traces the origin of the two names to a common mythology. The Karūṣas may be located on epigraphic evidence (A. S. R. III. 67-71) in the Shahabad district of Bihar. In such an environment Malada would be a vastly superior reading to Mālava.

(2) K. Tumura Tumbara / S. ? Tumbāna Tumbavana. This pair of names, which have been taken together for the sake of convenience, involves considerable difficulty both as regards their actual form and their location. Sircar's suggestion of Tumbavana is supported by the Bṛhatsaṁhitā, which locates them in the south and also by the evidence of the Tumain Inscription of Kumāragupta. (E. I. XXVI. pt. 3). A name, Tumbupa, occurs in the Mahābhārata (6.46 51) among the list of tribes on the wings of Yudhiṣṭhira's army, but, as there are numerous variants, it is far from certain that Tumbupa is the correct reading at that point. The Tumbaras are however mentioned in the Harivaṁśa (5. 310-1), where together with the Niṣādas they are described as the descendants of a king Niṣāda, while Buddhabhaṭṭa's[42] Ratna-parīkṣā and other texts describe their territory as a source of rubies. Accordingly we may accept Sircar's suggestion for this part of the text with the slight emendation of Tumbara for Tumbāna as both

42. Ratna-parīkṣā III. 124 (Text in Finot's Les Lapidaires Indiens p. 28), also Agastimata III. 177 (ibid. p. 106), Nava-ratna-parīkṣā IV. 108 (ibid. p. 159), Ratna-saṅgraha 8 (ibid. p. 196).

Tumbara and Tumbavana are established by independent literary and epigraphic sources.

(3) K. Ṣatpura / Paṭu. The diversity of readings both on the part of the original texts and of the critical editors indicates that the degree of corruption is considerable at this point. In his earlier edition of these texts published in his Bhāratavarṣa (p. 62), Kirfel originally adopted the Vāmana-purāṇa form, Vāhela, which Dey identified with Baghelkhand. The Vāyu-purāṇa reads Satsura and the Matsya-purāṇa Padgama or Satgama, but none of these forms can be traced elsewhere. If Ṣatpura is accepted as the reading here, it is evidently to be identified with the modern Satpura range. Such an assumption however seems extremely improbable for there is no evidence that Ṣatpura was in current usage at the time of the composition of the Purāṇas. Sircar's variant, Paṭu, seems the best reading in the present state of knowledge. While it cannot be traced elsewhere, at the same time it does not involve one in the difficulties that surround the adoption of Ṣatpura. For the present however there is insufficient evidence to attempt any solution of the problem.

Our survey of the textual problems now being completed, our results may accordingly be tabulated in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

Maladāś ca Karūṣāś ca Mekalāś cOtkalaiḥ saha

Uttamārṇā Daśārnāś ca Bhojāḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha
Tośalāḥ Kośalāś civa Traipurā Vaidiśās tatha
Tumbārās Tumbavanāś caiva Paṭavo Naiṣadhaiḥ saha

Anūpās Tuṇḍikerāś ca Vītihotrā Avantayaḥ

It now remains to identify the above briefly and so confirm their location in Vindhya-deśa.

(1) Malada. Mod. Baghelkhand region.

(2) Karūṣa. Mod. Shahabad district.

(3) Mekala. The inhabitants of the Maikal range.

(4) Utkala. Originally the Utkalas occupied the interior districts of Orissa near the Maikal hills. Later they extended eastwards towards the sea down the Mahānadī valley. Their capital may be placed at Chaudnar opposite Katak.

(5) Uttamārṇa. If we follow Wilson's interpretation of Daśārna as "ten forts", and translate Uttamārṇa as the "highest forts", it would be reasonable to locate them on the highest parts of the Vindhya, i. e. on the Mahadeo Hills.

(6) Daśārṇa. This people may be located on the banks of the river Daśārṇā (mod. Dhasan, which, rising near Saugor, flows through Bundelkhand into the Betwa). According to Jain sources its capital was Mṛttikavatī, which the Hari-vaṁśa (1.36.15) places on the Narmadā.

(7) Bhoja. According to purāṇic tradition, the Bhojas were a branch of Yādavas, who founded the kingdom of Vidarbha. Similarly in the Raghu-vaṁśa (V. 39.) the king of Vidarbha was a Bhoja. The mention of Bhojakaṭa in the Chammak Copper-plate Inscription of Pravarasena III (C.I.I. III. p. 236) proves that the territory occupied by the Bhojas in Berar included the areas of mod. Elichpur and Chammak.

(8) Kiṣkindhaka. Dey would connect this name with the famous Kiṣkindhya Mt. of the Rāmāyaṇa, and locate it near a small hamlet, which still retains the same name, in Dharwar district on the south bank of the Tuṅgabhadrā near Anagondi, three miles from Vijaynagar and close to Bellary. The purāṇic texts however imply a more northern location and this is supported by the Kūrma-vibhāga lists, which include the Kiṣkindhakas in the South-east (i. e. Vindhya) region.

(9). Tośala. Its extremely close association with the Dakṣiṇa Kośalas is attested by at least three other texts, Rāja-śekhara's Kāvyamīmāṁsā, Bharata's Nāṭya-śāstra and the Pari-

śiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda. It is also mentioned in Asoka's Rock Edict found at Dhauli, while other inscriptions refer to a Uttara Tośala and a Dakṣiṇa Tośala (EI. IX. 286; XV. 3.). The Gaṇḍa-vyūha, a Sanskrit Buddhist text, refers to a town of Tosala in Amita-Tosala. According to the epigraphic evidence, the Tośala-viṣaya covered a large area from the Suvarṇarekhā down to the Ṛṣikulyā. At the time of the composition of the purāṇic lists however it probably occupied a smaller area centred on the Dhauli and Balasor districts.

(10) Kosala. Epigraphic[43] evidence proves that the Dakṣiṇa-Kosalas occupied a large area of the Chattisgarh region, extending eastwards to Sambalpur district and the South Mahānadī Valley.

(11) Traipura. The inhabitants of the town of Tripurī (mod. Teor on the Narbadā, seven miles west of Jubbulpur. The Vaijayantī makes them synonymous with the Hāhālas (i e. a corruption of Ḍahāla) and the Cedis.

(12) Vaidiśa. The inhabitants of Vidiśā (mod. Bhilsa, 27 miles N-E of Bhopal).

(13) Tumbāra. Sircar tentatively identifies it with Turrān, 45 miles north of Ratanpur.

(14) Tumbavana. Mod. Tumain, 50 miles N-W of Eran in Gwalior State.

(15) Paṭu. Not identifiable.

(16) Naiṣadha. This people are generally located on the Satpura Hills, N-W of Berar.

(17) Anūpa. The Raghu-vaṁśa definitely establishes their location around Māhīṣmatī (mod. Māndhātā in Nimār District).

(18) Tuṇḍikera. Perhaps mod. Tendukhara near the Narmadā in Narsinghpur District.

(19) Vītihotra. A branch of the Haihayas. Their location within the Vindhya division is uncertain.

(20) Avanti. Mod. Malwa. Capital Ujjayinī (mod. Ujjain).

43. For detailed analysis of epigraphic evidence see Chaudhuri. p. 74ff.

HIMALAYAN DIVISION

Kirfel's text.

Nihārā Haṁsamārgāś ca Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khaṣāḥ
Kuthaprāvaraṇāś caiva Ūrṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Hūhukāḥ
Trigartā Maṇḍalāś caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha

Sircar's text.

Nirāhārā Haṁsamārgāḥ Kuravas Taṅgaṇāḥ Khasāḥ
Karṇaprāvaraṇāś caiva Hūṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Hūhukāḥ
Trigartā Mālavāś caiva Kirātās Tāmasaiḥ
(Tomaraiḥ ?) saha

An analysis of the above texts show the following variations.

(1) K. Nihāra. S. Nirāhāra; (2) K. Kupatha. S. Kuru; (3) K. Kuthaprāvaraṇa. S. Karṇaprāvaraṇa; (4) K. Ūrṇa. S. Hūṇa; (5) K. Maṇḍala. S. Mālava; (6) K. Tāmara. S. Tāmasa. (Tomara).

(1) Nihāra / Nirāhāra. The Vāyu-purāṇa variant, Nigarhāra, is interesting as it may be regarded as a colloquial form of Nagarahāra, which is mentioned in an inscription as a town of Uttarāpatha. The Parāśara[44] likewise locates it in the same division, while Hiuan Tsang refers to it as Na-kie-lo-ho. Alberuni locates the Nirāhāras as living behind Mārigāla i.e. Takṣaśilā (mod. Taxila). The consensus of this evidence would place the Nirāhāra in the vicinity of Jalalabad.

(2) Kupatha/Kuru. If the latter name is adopted as the reading, it must refer to the Uttara-kurus, a semi-mythical people living to the north of the Himalayas. Kupatha on the other hand may be connected with the Kārāpatha of the Raghuvaṁśa and the Kārupatha of the Rāmāyaṇa. It has been identified with Kārābagh or Baghan on the west bank of the Indus at the foot of the Salt Range in Bannu District. Though both Kuru and Kupatha may be located without difficulty in the Himalayas, the latter seems preferable, as they may be placed

44. J. A. S. B. XVII p. 492; Parāśara (Text in Bṛahatsaṁhitā, Vizianagram S. S. p. 293).

in the area suggested by their neighbours, Nirāhāra (Jalalabad), Hāṁsamārga (? Hunza and Nagar districts), and Taṅgaṇa (the region extending from the Rāmgaṅgā to the Upper Sarayū) much more easily than the Uttara-kurus, who must be located in Tibet.

(3) Kuthaprāvaraṇa/Karṇaprāvaraṇa. The Karṇaprāvaraṇas are mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa in the eastern division along with the Kirātas. Accordingly they may be located in the eastern Himalayas. Another tribe of the same name are placed by two passages of the Mahābhārata in the Vindhyas. The Karṇaprāveyas of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts, which are located in the S–W (i.e. N–W.) along with the Śūdras and Pāraśavas, are probably identical with the Karṇa-prāvaraṇas and the Rāmāyaṇa.

(4) Ūrṇa/Hūna. These names have been discussed in the Uttarāpatha section, paragraph. 22.

(5) Maṇḍala/Mālava. Sircar's text is almost certainly correct. At the time of the composition of the epic and purāṇic lists the Mālavas lived in the N–W and did not migrate to the Vindhyas until some time later. Their close association with the Trigartas is attested by several passages of the Mahābhārata. Kirfel's variant, Maṇḍala, cannot be traced elsewhere.

(6) Tāmara/? Tāmasa.? Tomara The people mentioned here must be identical with those mentioned immediately before the Kirātas in the Uttarāpatha section, where Kirfel and Sircar both agree on the name, Tomara. At the same time it must be stressed that there is nothing to prevent the choice of Tāmasa (the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tons) here, for such a location can easily be included within the Uttarāpatha and Himalayan divisions.

Though both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading, Hūhuka, as one of the names of this division, it is important to compare this name which occurs before Hūṇa and Dārva with that occurring before the same two names in the Uttarāpatha division where Kirfel reads Cāhuka and Sircar suggests its emendation

to Bāhika. For a discussion of this problem and the conclusions reached, see the Uttarāpatha section paragraph 21.

In accordance with our usual procedure, the result of our analysis can be tabulated in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names will denote new readings different from those of Kirfel and Sircar, while a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between the two.

Nirāhārā Haṁsamārgāḥ Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khasāḥ
Karṇaprāvaraṇāś caiva Huṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Kūhukāḥ
Trigartā Mālavāś caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha

It now remains to identify the above mentioned names briefly and so confirm their location in the Himalayan region. Unfortunately it is not possible to locate most of them with any precise degree of accuracy, as in mountainous areas such as this, many tribes would tend to be nomadic in their habits.

(1) Nirāhāra. The inhabitants of mod. Nanghenhar or Nangnihar, 4 miles west of Jalalabad.

(2) Haṁsamārga. Possibly mod. Hunza and Nagar districts.

(3) Kupatha. If, as is probable. this is regarded as identical with the Kārāpatha of the Raghuvaṁśa, it may be identified with Karabagh at the foot of the Salt Range in Bannu district. Upadhyaya[45] however has located it at Chandpur east of Saharanpur in the land of the Northern Mallas.

(4) Taṅgaṇa. The Ganganoi of Ptolemy, being an orthographical error for t. They may be located in the central Himalayas in the area stretching from the river Rāmagaṅgā to the Upper Sarayū.

(5) Khasa. Mod. Khakkhas to the west of Nepal.

45. India in Kalidasa, p. 68.

(6) Karṇaprāvaraṇa. As mentioned previously the evidence of the Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa would place them in the Eastern Himalayas.

(7-9) Hūṇa Dārva Kūhuka. For their location see the Uttarāpatha section.

(10) Trigarta. Mod. Jalandhar region.

(11) Mālava. They are generally identified with the Malloi of the Greeks and located in the area of Multan, which is rather too far south to be included in the Himalayas. This identification of Skt. Mālava and Gk. Malloi is by no means certain. In the first place it is reasonable to assume that the Greeks would transcribe Sanskrit place-names as accurately as the phonemes of their native language would permit. Accordingly Malloi is a more accurate transcription of Skt. Malla than of Mālava. Moreover the Mallas are well-known in Sanskrit Literature as the name of a tribe, being mentioned in the Epics, Purāṇas, the Parāśara-tantra, the Bṛhat-saṁhitā and the geographical section of the Mahā-māyūrī etc. The objection to the identification of Greek Malloi with Skt. Malla however does not depend on any linguistic argument, but on grounds of geographical location. The Mallas mentioned in the Epics and Purāṇas are located by these texts in the East; the Malloi of the Greeks must neeessarily be in the N-W. In view of this discrepancy of direction Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malla cannot be associated together; therefore one must search for a name that overcomes this obstacle. This is to be found in Sanskrit Mālava, which is conveniently listed in the North by passages in the Epics and Purāṇas. On the basis of these arguments Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malāvas are considered to refer to one and the same people. This conclusion however fails to take into account one important piece of evidence, that of the Parāśara-tantra, which locates the Mallas in the north-West along with the Tuṣāras and Tālas. This evidence overcomes the objection to equating Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malla, as one may now assume the existence of *two* branches of Mallas, one in the East and the other in the

North-West. Moreover the Parāśara-tantra specifically mentions the Mālavas as distinct from the Mallas, and locates them in the North. Accordingly, this information makes the problem of the location of the Mālavas easier to solve. One is no longer troubled by the difficulty of having to assume that they migrated from the area between the Jhelum and the Chenab (where Greek sources place the Malloi) at some date soon after Alexander's invasion to Nagarchal in mod. Jaipur district where large hordes of their coins have been found. The former area was occupied by the Mallas and the latter by the Mālavas who may have migrated there from the Himalayas, if their inclusion in the list of "mountainous" countries is correct.

(12) Kirāta and (13) Tāmara. For location see Uttarāpatha section, nos 37 and 38.

In conclusion a peculiar feature of the Himalayan list requires a brief comment. It will be noticed that of the 13 tribes enumerated, no fewer than 7 have already been located in Uttarāpatha, viz. Haṁsamārga, Tāṅgaṇa, Hūṇa Dārva, Hūhuka (? Kūhuka), Kirāta, and Tāmara. Furthermore all these names have been taken from the last two ślokas of the Uttarāpatha section only. The reason that at onee suggests itself as an explanation of this repetition is that the Himalayan portion may be a later addition to the whole text, perhaps with the purpose of giving a more detailed description of that particular area to the reader, the Vaijayantī appears to supply some evidence in support of this view. While as regards the other six divisions it follows the Purāṇas exactly. it yet omits the Himalayan region which, if its mention of the Trigartas is any criterion, it must have included in Uttarāpatha. It is quite clear therefore that the Uttarāpatha and Himalayan regions must overlap one another to some extent in the Purāṇas ; had they each represented a distinctly separate area, no such repetitions would have been possible. In this respect it is worth comparing them with the Vindhya section, where every single name (with the possible exception of Anūpa) is a new one. In view of these considerations therefore we may conclude that the Himalayan portion was not originally part of

this geographical list, but may later have been added as an amplification of the last part of the Uttarāpatha section. Compare:

Uttarāpatha—

> Aupagāś cĀlimadrāś ca Kirātānāṁ ca jāṭayaḥ
> Tāmarā Haṁsamārgāś ca Kāśmīrās Taṅganāḥ
> Kulutāḥ Kuhukāś caiva Hūṇā Darvās tathaiva ca

Himālayas—

> Nigarhārā Haṁsamārgāḥ Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khasāḥ
> Karṇaprāvaraṇāś caiva Hūṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Kūhukāḥ
> Trigartā Mālavāś caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha

With the investigation of the Himalayan list completed, all the geographical names of the Bhuvanakośa texts have been examined. Of the large number of names included in this list about three-quarters of them have been now identified with some degree of accuracy. No one is more aware than the author that a number of suggested readings and identifications are extremely tentative, but if they only serve to arouse interest and even controversy in this important subject, he feels they will have achieved their purpose.

पुराणेष्वपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त

[Almost in every Purāṇa there are found a number of non-Pāṇinian uses which generally pertain to hiatus, re-sandhi (or double sandhi), remodelling of the basic forms of some words on the lines of Prākṛta-forms, inflectional and conjugational forms influenced by Prākṛta, and also actual Prākṛta forms found incidentally written by scribes in some of the old manuscripts of the Purāṇas. These non-Pāṇinian uses are often held as *ārṣa prayogas*. But in the present article it is shown that they are mostly due to the exigencies of metre, or to the influence of Prākṛta or to both. For this purpose, the article has divided non-Pāṇinian uses of the Purāṇas into five main heads with several sub-heads. Each head and sub-head is, then, discussed with appropriate illustrations from the printed editions and manuscripts of several important Purāṇas. Editors and scribes have often tried to emend these non-Paṇinian uses. Such emendations have also been illustrated here.

On account of some Prākṛta or Prākṛta-influenced forms met with in the Purāṇas, Pargiter held that the Purāṇas, and specially their genealogical chapters, were originally composed in Prākṛta, and later on sanskritized by the Purāṇic redactors. The present article has also briefly discussed this point. According to the view expressed in this article, there might have been parallel genealogical literature composed in Prākṛta by some Sūtas and Māgadhas attached to royal courts, and the Purānic redactors might have also incorporated a few of these Prākṛta ślokas into the genealogical Sanskrit accounts of the Purāṇas, and hence some stray Prākṛta uses in the Purāṇas. A.S.G.]

अथ पुराणेषु वर्त्तमानानाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां विचारः प्रस्तूयते। प्रायः सर्वेष्वेव पुराणेषु बहवोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगा विद्यन्ते। आर्षास्ते प्रयोगा इति मत्वा तेषां साधुत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते। कामं सन्तु तेषां मध्ये कतिचित् प्रयोगा आर्षा अपि, परन्तु ते सर्वेऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगा आर्षा एवेति मतं तु न समीचीनं प्रतीयते, अनेकेषाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां तत्र छन्दोऽनुरोध-प्राकृतभाषाप्रभावाद्यनेककारणमूलकत्वात्। अपि च, भगवता पाणिनिना 'आर्ष' इति शब्दो वेदे एव नियमित इति तस्य 'सम्बुद्धौ शाकल्यस्येतावनार्षे' (पा० १।१।१६) प्रभृतिभिः सूत्रैर् ज्ञायते। वेदेतरवाङ्मये च तेन 'अनार्ष' इति शब्दोऽत्र प्रयुक्त इति तु स्पष्टमेव। वेदसंहिताः, ब्राह्मणानि, आरण्यकानि, उपनिषदश्चेत्येतद् वाङ्मयमेव वेदे (छन्दसि) अन्तर्भवति; काशिकादिवृत्तिषु छन्दोविषयकाण्युदाहरणानि च अस्मादेव वैदिकवाङ्मयाद् उद्धृत्य प्रदत्तानि। अतः पुराणेषु प्राप्यमाणा ये एव वैदिका वैदिकव्याकरणानुसारिणो वा प्रयोगास् ते एव तत्र वस्तुतः 'आर्ष' प्रयोगा मन्तव्याः; यथा भागवते 'भस्मनि हुतम्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'भस्मन् हुतम्' (१।१५।२१), 'प्रतिहर्त्तुम्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'प्रतिहर्त्तवे' (३।५।४७), तथा 'धीमहि' (१।१।१), 'अभिधीमहि' (८।३।२) इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः।

वेदे 'भिस्' विभक्तौ अकारान्तशब्दानां 'पूर्वेभिः' ····· 'नूतनैः' (ऋ० वे० १।१।२) तथा 'कर्णेभिः' ····· 'अङ्गैः' (ऋ० वे० १।८९।८) इत्यादय उभयथा प्रयोगा एकत्रापि प्राप्यन्ते। अकारान्तप्रातिपदिकानां तृतीयाबहुवचने 'भिस'न्ताः प्रयोगास् तु पाणिनिमतेन छन्दस्येव भवन्ति बहुलं[1], न तु लौकिके संस्कृते। लौकिकसंस्कृते तु केवलं 'कर्पूरैः', 'मानसैः' इत्यादय 'ऐस'न्ताः प्रयोगाः शिष्टाः, प्राकृते च पुनः 'कप्पूरेहि', 'माणसेहि' इत्यादयो 'भिस'न्ता एव प्रयोगा दृश्यन्ते। पुनश्च, वेदे यथा—अकारान्त-नपुंसकलिङ्गशब्दस्य प्रथमाद्वितीययोर्बहुवचने 'विश्वान्यद्भुता' (ऋ० वे० १।२५।११), विश्वा भुवनानि' (ऋ० वे० १।१५४।२,४), 'विश्वानि दुरितानि' (ऋ० वे० ५।८२।५) इत्यादय उभयथा प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते, तथा पालिप्राकृतेऽपि 'फला', 'फलानि' इत्यादयो द्विविधाः प्रयोगा विद्यन्ते। पुनः, वेदे असमासे इव

१. पा० ७।१। ९, १०

अनञ्पूर्वे समासेऽपि (अर्थात् उपसर्गपूर्वकाद्धातोरपि) 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशः क्वचिन्न भवति, एवं च यथा असमासे 'हुत्वा' (ऋ० वे० १०।१४।८), कृत्वा (१०।९।१) इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः, तथा समासेऽपि 'परिधापयित्वा'[2] 'प्रत्यर्थयित्वा'[3] प्रभृतयः प्रयोगा वेदे वर्तन्ते । एवमेव पालिभाषायामपि 'पचित्वा' 'उप्पतित्वा' इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते । वेदे च समासे इव असमासेऽपि क्वचित् 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशः साधुः, यथा 'निषद्य' (ऋ० वे० १०।१४।५), 'उद्धृत्य'[4] इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः, एवम् 'अर्च्य'[5], 'अज्य'[6] इत्यादयोऽपि प्रयोगा वेदे कल्पसूत्रेषु च उपलभ्यन्ते । प्राकृते तु पुनः 'क्त्वा' स्थाने समासेऽसमासे सर्वत्रैव 'ल्यप्' आदेशो दृश्यते, यथा 'उप्पाडिअ' (संस्कृते—उत्पाट्य), 'उवविसिअ' (सं०—उपविश्य), 'परिहरिअ' (सं०—परिहृत्य), 'भविअ' (सं०—भूत्वा), 'भणिअ' (सं०—भणित्वा), 'जाणिअ' (सं०—ज्ञात्वा), 'णाइअ' (सं०—नीत्वा) इत्यादिषु प्रयोगेषु । एवं स्थिते, यदि पुराणेषु 'येहि' (=येभिः), 'वर्षा' (=वर्षाणि), 'उत्सादयित्वा' (=उत्साद्य), 'प्रवर्तयित्वा' (=प्रवर्त्य), 'गृह्य' (=गृहीत्वा), पूज्य (=पूजयित्वा) प्रभृतयोऽपाणिनीयाः प्रयोगा अपि प्राप्यन्ते[7], तर्हि किमेते प्रयोगा आर्षाः, उत प्राकृतप्रतिरूपाः प्राकृतानुकारिणो वा, छन्दोऽनुरोधजन्या वा—इत्ययं प्रश्नः समाधेयः ।

इदमप्यत्रावधेयं यत् पुराणानि खलु परमर्षिणा व्यासेन लोकहितार्थाय संकलितानि रचितानि वा । अतो वर्णजातिलिङ्गादिभेदमनपेक्ष्य सर्वेषामेव जनानां पुराणानां पठने श्रवणे चाधिकारोऽभ्युपगम्यते । अतएव पुराणवाचकाः सूता व्यासाश्च जनसंसदि पुराणानि वाचयन्ति स्म । जनसामान्यस्य च भाषा सदैव

---

२. 'कृष्णं वासो यजमानं परिधापयित्वा' (पा० ७।१।३८, काशि०)

३. 'प्रत्यञ्चमर्कं प्रत्यर्थयित्वा' (तत्रैव)

४. 'उद्धृत्य जुहोति' (तत्रैव)

५. 'अर्च्यं तान् देवान् गतः (तत्रैव)

७. कल्पसूत्रेषु चापि 'आज्येनाक्षिणी अज्य' इति । (पा० ७।१।३८, सि० कौ०, सुबोधिनीव्याख्या)

७ उदाहरणानि तूपरिष्टान्निवेदयिष्यन्ते ।

८. 'इह लोकहितार्थाय संक्षिप्तं परमर्षिणा' (मत्स्य०, ५३।५६ पू)

प्रायेण प्राकृतम् आसीत्। वेदेऽपि 'तितउ'[९] प्रभृतयः प्राकृतप्रतिरूपाः शब्दा उपलभ्यन्ते। भगवता पाणिनिना स्वसूत्रेषु 'भाषायाम्' इति शब्दप्रयोगस्तु शिष्टविशेषाणां भाषां संस्कृतमधिकृत्यैव कृतः, न तु जनसामान्यस्य भाषामधिकृत्य। लोकहितार्थं लौकिकसंस्कृते उपनिबद्धं सूतव्यासादिपरम्परया च लोके प्रचार्यमाणं पुराणवाङ्मयं लोकभाषया प्राकृतेन प्रभावितमभूदिति सम्भावना तु नापलाप्या। पुनश्च, पुराणानि खलु काले काले प्रतिभासम्पन्नैः सूतैर् व्यासैर् अन्यैर् वा पुराणविज्ञैः कविभिः परिवर्द्धितानि संक्षिप्तानि विपरिवर्त्तितानि वा—इति प्राचीन-पुराणकोशानां सम्यग् अध्ययनेन स्पष्टं प्रतीयते। तस्माद् रचनाकाले प्रति-संस्करणकाले वा पौराणिकी भाषा प्राकृतप्रभावेण अस्पृष्टा नासीदित्यपि निश्चित-प्रायमेव। प्राचीन-पुराणपुस्तकानां कैश्चन प्राकृतज्ञैर् लेखकैरपि पुराणानां कानिचित् संस्कृतपदानि ज्ञानतोऽज्ञानतो वा प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि कृतानि, परवर्त्ति-भिश्च लिपिकारैस् तानि तथैव प्रतिलिपीकृतानि च। पुनश्च, पुराणेषूपलभ्यमानानां राजवंशावलीनां केचिद् अंशाः सूतमागधादिभिर् मूलतः प्राकृते एव रचिताः स्युः, पश्चाच्च तेंऽशाः पुराणप्रतिसंस्कर्तृभिः संस्कृते परिवर्त्य पुराणेषु संयोजिताः स्युः इत्यपि संभावना वर्त्तते।[१०] अत एव पुराणेषु क्वचिद् द्वितीयास्थाने प्रथमा विभक्तिः प्रयुक्ता दृश्यते,[११] परन्तु संस्कृतवाक्यरचनायाम् एतादृशः प्रयोगोऽसाधु-रेव, प्राकृते तु प्रथमाद्वितीययोः प्रायेण समानरूपत्वात् साधुरेव तत्रेदृशः प्रयोगः। पुराणेषु केषुचित् श्लोकेषु छन्दोभङ्गदोषोऽप्यपाणिनीयप्रयोगेण सह प्राप्यते, परन्तु यदि ते श्लोकाः पुनः प्राकृते परिवर्त्येरन्, तर्हि तत्र छन्दोदोषस्या-भावो जायते, असाधुप्रयोगश्च साधुः सम्पद्यते।[१२] तस्मात् स्पष्टमेतत् यत्

---

९. द्रष्टव्यम्—ऋ० वे० १०।७१।२. उणादिसूत्रेषु यद्यपि 'तितउ' शब्दस्य √तन्+डउ—इति व्युत्पत्तिः कल्पिता, तथापि मूलतोऽयं शब्दः प्राकृतप्रतिरूपक एव।

१०. अपि च द्रष्टव्यम् - पार्जिटर, पुराण-टैक्स्ट आफ दि डाइनैस्टीज़ आफ दि कलि-एज', परिशिष्ट १। निखिलान्येव राजवंशावलीप्रकरणानि मूलतः प्राकृते एव रचितानि पश्चाच्च तानि संस्कृते विपरिवर्तितानि—इति पार्जिटरमहोदयोऽत्र मन्यते। पुराणेषूपलभ्य-मानानां राजवंशावलीनां केचिदेवांशा मूलतः प्राकृते रचिता आसन्, ते च पश्चात् संस्कृते परिवर्त्य पूर्वरचितैः शेषैः संस्कृतांशैः सह पुराणेषु संयोजिताः—इति मतं तु लेखेऽस्मिन् प्रतिपाद्यते।

११, १२. उदाहरणानि त्वग्रे द्रष्टव्यानि।

पुराणेषु प्राकृतमूलात्मकस्य अंशस्य प्राकृतच्छायारूपे संस्कृते विपरिवर्त्तनादपि केषुचित् स्थलेषु छन्दोभङ्गदोषो विद्यते।[13]

निष्कर्षस्तु—पुराणेषु केचिद् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः प्राकृतप्रभाविताः प्राकृतच्छायारूपा वा, अन्ये च छन्दोऽनुरोधाद् अपाणिनीयाः संजाताः। तत्र क्वचिद् आर्षा अपि प्रयोगा वर्तन्ते, परन्तु ते विरला एव। पुराणेष्वपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां सद्भावे तु बहुत्र छन्दोभङ्गप्रसङ्गपरिहार एव मुख्यो हेतुर् इति तूपरिष्टात् स्पष्टीक्रियते।

एतादृशान् प्राकृतच्छायारूपान् काँश्चिद् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगान् दृष्ट्वैव प्रसिद्धपुराणविदुषः पार्जिटरमहोदयस्य मतं संजातं यद् मत्स्यवायुब्रह्माण्डादीनि पुराणानि मूलतः प्राकृतभाषायामेव रचितान्यासन्, पश्चाच्च तानि प्राकृतच्छायारूपे संस्कृते परिवर्तितानि। भारतीयवाङ्मयमन्तरा पार्जिटरस्य क्षत्रियपरम्पराविषयकः सिद्धान्त एवास्य मतस्याधारोऽस्ति। भारतीयवाङ्मये द्वे परम्परे आस्ताम्—ब्राह्मणपरम्परा, क्षत्रियपरम्परा च; ब्राह्मणपरम्पराया वेदब्राह्मणारण्यकप्रभृतयो ग्रन्थाः संस्कृते एव रचिता आसन्, क्षत्रियपरम्परायाः (सूतपरम्परायाः) पुराणादयो ग्रन्थास्तु प्राकृते रचिताः, पश्चाच्च ते ब्राह्मणजातीयैः प्रतिसंस्कर्तृभिः संस्कृते विपरिवर्तिताः—इति पार्जिटरमहोदयस्य सिद्धान्तः।[14] पार्जिटरमहोदयस्य मतद्वयं कीथोपाह्वेन आङ्ग्लविदुषा[15] 'जैकोबि' नाम्ना जर्मनविदुषा[15] च निराकृतम्, तथा च पुसाल्करमहोदयेनापि मतस्यास्य निराकरणं क्रियते।[16] तस्मात् पार्जिटरमतं तु विवादास्पदमेव तिष्ठति। अस्तु। प्रकृतमधुनाऽनुसरामः।

१३. प्राकृतश्लोकस्य संस्कृते विपरिवर्त्तनम्, अथवा प्राकृतच्छायारूपश्लोकस्य निर्माणं प्रायेण छन्दोभङ्गस्य कारणं भवति। अतएव राजशेखरकृतबालभारतस्य (निर्णयसागरप्रेस-संस्करण, १९२७) द्वितीयाङ्कस्य तृतीयश्लोकस्य टिप्पण्यां 'प्राकृतच्छायारूपोऽयं श्लोकः, अतएवच्छन्दोभङ्गः' इति निर्दिष्टम्।

१४. पार्जिटर, 'एन्शियेन्ट इंडियन हिस्टॉरिकल ट्रेडिशन' पृ० ५-१४।

१५. द्र०—'जरनल आफ रायल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी' १९१४, पृ० १०२८-३०।

१६. द्र०—पुसाल्कर, 'स्टडीज् इन दि एपिक्स एंड दि पुराणज', पृ० २६-३०।

पुराणेषु प्राप्ता अपाणिनीयप्रयोगा अधोनिर्दिष्टेषु विभागेषु विभज्य विचार्यन्ते—

१. स्वरसंधिसम्बधिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) विवृत्तिः (hiatus)

(आ) द्विःसंधिः (double sandhi)

२. प्रातिपदिकसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

३. सुबन्तपदसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) कारकविभक्तिसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(१) सम्प्रदाने सप्तमी

(२) 'नमः' योगे सप्तमी

(३) प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि विभक्तिरूपाणि

(आ) लिङ्गव्यत्ययः ।

४. तिङन्तपदसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) लङि 'अट्', 'आट्' आगमयोरभावः

(आ) आत्मनेपदस्य स्थाने परस्मैपदप्रयोगः

(१) कर्तृवाच्ये, (२) कर्मवाच्ये

५. 'क्त्वा'ऽन्तसम्बन्विनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) समासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्'-आदेशाभावः

(आ) असमासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य ल्यप्

पुराणानां मुद्रितपुस्तकेषु बह्वो अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः सम्पादकैः संशोधिताः—इति प्रतीयते। परन्तु प्राचीनकोशेषु प्रायेण मौलिका एव ते प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते। क्वचित्तु तेष्वपि लिपिकारैः केचिद् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः स्वबुद्ध्यनुसारेण संशोधिताः। अतो येषु हस्तलेखेषु ईदृशाः संशोधिताः प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते, ते प्रायशो अर्वाचीनतरा एव मन्तव्याः, तस्माद् ईदृशानां कोशानां तान् प्रयोगान् अन्तरा प्रामाण्यं नाभ्युपेयम्।

अत्र केषाञ्चित् पुराणानां मुद्रितपुस्तकेभ्यः[१७], तथा मत्स्यपुराणस्य प्राचीनकोशेभ्यश्च[१८] संगृह्य पूर्वोक्तविभागेषु विभक्तानाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां कतिचिद् उदाहरणानि स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन प्रदर्श्यन्ते ।

१. संधिसम्बन्धिनो अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) विवृत्तिः (hiatus)

[संस्कृतभाषायां केवलं प्रगृह्याणां प्रकृतिभावस्थले, तथा 'लोपः शाकल्यस्य' (पा० ८।३।१९) इति सूत्रानुसारेण अवर्णपूर्वयोः पदान्तयकारवकारयोर् लोपे कृते च पूर्वपरयोर् अव्यवहितयोर् द्वयोः स्वरयोर् युगपत् प्रयोगः पाणिनिसम्मतः । पुराणेषु तु पुनर् अन्यत्रापि द्वयोर् अव्यवहितयोः स्वरयोः प्रयोगेन विवृत्तिर् वर्त्तते सा च विवृत्तिः केषु चित् स्थलेषु लिपिकारैः सम्पादकैर् वा 'इति', 'च', 'तु' 'हि' प्रभृतिनिपातानां प्रयोगेन पाठभेदेन वा संशोधिताऽपि दृश्यते । एतत्तु सर्वमग्रे उदाहरणैः स्पष्टीक्रियते ।]

उदाहरणानि

(१) दातव्यं याचमानस्य इति मे व्रतमास्थितम् । (मत्स्य०-कोशेषु)

　　,,　　०स्य हीति ,,　　,,　। (मत्स्य०, ३१।३२ पू)

(२) विद्युन्माली इवाम्बुदः । (N_1 कोशे)

　　०लीव चाम्बुदः । (D_5, D_6)

　　०ली त्विवाम्बुदः । (मत्स्य०, १३०।८ उ)

(३) पूर्ववद् गुरुऋत्विग्भ्यः ... (मत्स्य०, ६०।६ उ; कोशेष्वपि)

१७. अस्मिन् लेखे आकरनिर्देशार्थं मत्स्य०-वायु०-ब्रह्म०-अग्नि०-पद्मपुराणानाम् आनन्दाश्रमस्य, विष्णुभागवतयोर् गीताप्रेसस्य, अन्येषां च पुराणानां वेंकटेश्वरप्रेसस्य संस्करणानि प्रयुक्तानि ।

१८. मत्स्यपुराणस्य त्रिंशत् कोशाः काशिराजन्यास-पुराणविभागे संवादिताः (collated), येषां परिचयो मया 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः प्रथमभागस्य १०१-१११ पृष्ठेषु प्रदत्तः । अस्मिन् लेखे प्रयुक्तानां मत्स्यपुराणकोश-संकेतानां च स्पष्टीकरणं तत्रैव वर्तते ।

[अत्र समासे नित्यसंधेरपि परिहारेण विवृत्तिः केवलं छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव। संधौ कृते तु, अनुष्टुप्पादेऽस्मिन् सप्ताक्षराण्येव स्युः।]

(४) मूत्रं कृत्वोपस्पृशन्ति अकृत्वा पादधावनम्। (मत्स्य०-कोशेषु)
,, ,, ०न्ति चाकृत्वा ,, । (मत्स्य०, १३१।४४ पू)

(५) आसूर्यं च अशामहे। (D_{3-7})
०र्यं तदशामहे। ($D_{10, 11}$)
०र्यं तदशीमहि। (मत्स्य०, २०४।७ उ)

(६) सांख्ययोगौ उभावपि (D_{12})
सांख्ययोगावुभावपि ($D_{1, 2, 10, 13, 14}$)
सांख्ययोगौ भवाभवौ (मत्स्य०, २४८।१७ उ)

(७) नारा इत्युच्यते आपो ऋषिभिस् ···। (N_1, $D_{3-8, 12}$)
,, ,, ०ते ह्यापो ह्यृषिभिस् ··· (मत्स्य०, २४८।४२ उ)

[यद्यपि 'आपो ऋषिभिस्' अत्र ऋवर्णे रेफध्वनिं मत्वा कोशेषु तथैव संधिः कृतः, अन्यथा 'आप ऋषिभिस्' इति संधिः कर्तव्य आसीत्, अतएव कोशेषु विवृत्तिरत्र न मन्यते। परन्तु मत्स्यपुराणस्य आनन्दाश्रमसम्पादकैरत्रापि विवृत्तिं मत्वा 'हि' निपातस्य प्रयोगेण सा निवारिता।]

(८) पुरतो यदुसिंहस्य अमोघस्य। (वामन०, केषुचित् कोशेषु)
,, ०स्य ह्यमोघस्य। (वामन०, ६५।४८ उ)

(९) कुण्डिनं न प्रवेक्ष्यामि अहत्वा ···। (ब्रह्म०, १९९।९ पू)

(१०) पुष्करे तु अजं दृष्ट्वा ···। (पद्म०, ५।२९।२४१ उ)

अत्र प्रदत्तैर् उदाहरणैः स्पष्टमेतद् यत् छन्दोदोषपरिहारायैव विवृत्तिरत्र समाश्रिता आसीत्। सा च केषुचित् कोशेषु मुद्रितपुस्तकेषु च निपातप्रयोगादिना संशोधिता वर्तते।

यत्र पूर्वनिर्दिष्ट(पा० ८।३।१९)-सूत्रानुसारेण विवृत्तिः पाणिनि-सम्मताऽपि वर्तते स्म, तत्रापि विवृत्तिम् असहमानैर्लिपिकारैः सम्पादकैर्वा निपातानां प्रयोगः कृतः, पाठभेदो वा समाश्रितः ; यथा—

अनामया अशोकाश्च ······ । ($Ś_1$-शारदाकोशे)

०या ह्यशोकाश्च ······ । (मत्स्य०, ११४।६५ पू, कोशेषु च)

शक्रविष्णू इवापरौ । (मत्स्य०, ३२।६ उ)

विष्णुशक्राविवापरौ । (D_{10} कोशे)

(आ) द्विः संधिः (Double Sandhi)

[भगवतः पाणिनेर् मते ८।३।१९ प्रभृतिभिः सूत्रैर् अवर्णपूर्वयोः पदान्तयकार-वकारयोर्लोपे कृतेऽपि ८।२।१ सूत्रानुसारेण तत्र लोपस्यासिद्धत्वात् पूर्वपरयोः स्वरयोः पुनः संधिर् न भवति । परन्तु पुराणेषु तादृशेष्वपि केषुचित् स्थलेषु पुनः संधिर् (द्विः संधिर्) दृश्यते । द्विःसंधिश्चायं प्रायेण छन्दोदोषपरि-हारार्थमेवाश्रितः । अत्रापि क्वचित् लिपिकारैः सम्पादकैश्च निपातप्रयोगादिना द्विः संधिः संशोधितः ।]

उदाहरणानि

(१) सर्वानन्तफलाः प्रोक्ताः (मत्स्य०, ६४।४, कोशेषु च)

[सर्वानन्तफलाः, <सर्वा अनन्त०, <सर्वाः (०स् > ०य्) अनन्त० । अत्रानुष्टुप्पादे नवाक्षरप्रसङ्गपरिहारार्थं द्विः संधिः]

(२) तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायात् (अग्नि०, १८५।१३ उ)

[तस्याग्रतः, <तस्या (=देव्याः) अग्रतः, <तस्याः (०स् > ०य्) अग्रतः]

(३) विरेमुरेवं च सुराभिधाय । (मत्स्य०, १५६।१८)

[सुराभिधाय, <सुरा अभिधाय, <सुराः (०स् > ०य्) अभिधाय]

(४) मृतश्च राजा स पुरूरवाभूत् । (वामन०, ७६।८४ उ)

[पुरूरवाभूत्, <पुरूरवा अभूत्, <पुरूरवाः (०स् > ०य्) अभूत्]

(५) हृष्टोत्तीर्य रथात्सद्यः । (ब्रह्माण्ड०, २।३६।२८ उ)

[हृष्टोत्तीर्य, <हृष्ट उत्तीर्य, <हृष्टः (हृष्य्) उत्तीर्य]

(६) कपालिनैकवीराय । (७ कोशेषु)

कपालिने च वीराय । (मत्स्य०, ४७।१३७ उ)

[कपालिनैकवीराय, <कपालिन एकवीराय, <कपालिने एकवीराय]

(७) तथाऽर्यम्णेति नैर्ऋते (७ कोशेषु)

" ०म्णे च नैर्ऋते (मत्स्य०, ७६।६ उ)

[अर्यम्णेति, <अर्यम्ण इति, <अर्यम्णे इति]

२. प्रातिपदिकसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

[पुराणेषु प्राकृतप्रभावेण छन्दोऽनुरोधेन च क्वचित् 'तेजस्', 'यशस्', 'शिरस्', 'श्रेयस्', 'सरस्' प्रभृतीनाम् 'अस्'-अन्तशब्दानां सकारलोपं कृत्वा तेषाम् अकारान्तत्वं (स्त्रियाम्—आकारान्तत्वं) कृतम् । एवम्, अन्येऽपि प्राकृतप्रभाविताः प्रातिपदिकसम्बन्धिनो अपाणिनीयविकाराः पुराणेषु दृश्यन्ते ।]

उदाहरणानि—

(१) भ्रष्टतेजाः स्त्रियो जाताः (मत्स्य०, १८८।१०)

[अत्र 'अस्'-अन्तस्य 'भ्रष्टतेजस्' इति शब्दस्य स्त्रियां 'भ्रष्टतेजा' इत्याकारान्तत्वं कृत्वा तस्य जसि रूपं प्रयुक्तम् । 'भ्रष्टतेजसः' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'भ्रष्टतेजाः' इत्यपाणिनीयेन पाठेन अत्र नवाक्षरप्रसङ्गपरिहारोऽपि कृतः । प्राकृतप्रभावस्त्वत्र स्पष्ट एव ।]

(२) नलवंशप्रसूतास्ते वीर्यवन्तो महायशाः । (वायुपु०, ६६ ।…)

[अत्र 'महायशाः इति प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकः पाठः वायुपुराणस्य इंडिया आफिसपुस्तकालयस्थे E 3589संख्यके कोशे वर्तते । अस्य कोशस्य

लेखनकालः १४८३ ई० ।[19] प्राकृतप्रभावोऽप्यत्र वर्तते, छन्दोदोषपरिहारार्थ-मप्येष पाठः समाश्रितः]

(३) मासि मार्गशिरे नरैः (वामन०, ६५।८२, तत्कोशेषु च)

[अत्र 'मार्गशिरसि' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'मार्गशिरे' इति प्रयोगस्तु नवाक्षरप्रसङ्गपरिहाराय प्रतीयते । कोशद्वये 'मार्गशीर्षे नरोत्तमैः' इति पाठो वर्तते ।)

(४) जगतः श्रेयकारणम् (वामन०, ४४।१)

[अत्र 'श्रेयःकारणम्' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'श्रेयकारणम्' इति पाठस्तु अनुष्टुप्-पादे पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वकरणार्थम् ।]

(५) तथैव सरमाहात्म्यं ब्रूहि (वामन०, ४३।२)

(६) पप्रच्छ सरमाहात्म्यं (४३।५)

(७) ब्रूहि मे सरमाहात्म्यं (४३।६)

[अत्र त्रिष्वपि स्थलेषु 'सरो०' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'सर०' इति प्रयोगोऽत्र अनुष्टुभि पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वकरणार्थम् । यत्र तादृश्यपेक्षा न वर्तते तत्र 'सरस्-' ('महत्सरस्तेन पूर्णः' वामन०, ४२।२८), 'सरसो-' ('प्रमाणं सरसो ब्रूहि' २२।४८), 'सरो-' (रुद्रेण च सरोमध्यं प्रविष्टेन-' २२।५८) प्रभृतयः प्रयोगा एव दृश्यन्ते ।]

(८) दुहितां प्रशशंस च (मत्स्य०, १५४।२६, कोशेषु च)

[अत्र 'दुहितरं इति पाठस्य स्थाने 'दुहितां' इति पाठो नवाक्षरप्रसङ्ग-परिहाराय । अस्मिन् स्थले शारदालिपिकोशे 'प्रशशंस दुहितरम्' इति संशोधितः पाठो विद्यते । अन्यत्रापि च मात्स्ये तत्कोशेषु च 'वधाच्च दुहितुर्मम' इति पाठ एव वर्तते ।]

(९) विश्रान्ताय महान्ताय (मत्स्य०, ४७।१५१ ; तत्कोशेषु च)

---

१९. द्र०—पार्जिटर, पु० टे०, पृ० ५१, टि० २५ ।

[अत्र 'विश्रान्ताय' इत्यस्य पदस्य सन्निधौ तद्ध्वनिसाम्यार्थं 'महते' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'महान्ताय' इति पाठो धृतः। अनेन पाठेन चात्र छन्दः-पादपूर्त्तिरपि भवति; अन्यथा 'महते' इति पाठेन सप्ताक्षराण्येव स्युः। पुनश्च 'महान्ताय' इति पाठे पालिप्राकृतप्रभावोऽपि दृश्यते, पालिप्राकृते 'महत्' इत्यस्य 'महन्त' इति प्रातिपादिकरूपो भवति।]

(१०) स्वाहाय च स्वधाय च (मत्स्य०, ४७।१५७ पू)

[अत्र शिवस्तोत्रे 'स्वाहा' 'स्वधा' इत्यव्ययशब्दयोर् अकारान्तत्वं कृत्वा तयोश्चतुर्थ्यन्ते पदे शिवस्य विशेषणत्वेनाभिधानत्वेन वा प्रयुक्ते स्तः; अग्रे तृतीये पादे 'वषट्कारात्मने चैव' इति पदस्य वर्त्तमानत्वात्। 'स्वाहा' 'स्वधा', 'वषट्' इति त्रीण्यपि पदानि स्वरादिगणे पठितानि।

३. सुबन्तसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) कारकविभक्तिसम्बन्धिनः

[पुराणेषु क्वचित् सम्प्रदानेऽपि चतुर्थीस्थाने सप्तमी विभक्तिः प्रयुक्ता दृश्यते, क्वचिच्च 'नमः'-शब्दयोगेऽपि चतुर्थीस्थाने सप्तमी दृश्यते, क्वचित्तु प्राकृतप्रभावाद्धेतोर् द्वितीयायामपि प्रथमावद् प्रयोगा विद्यन्ते। अन्योऽपि विभक्तिव्यत्ययः पुराणेषु यत्र तत्र प्राप्यते।]

(१) सम्प्रदाने सप्तमी—

मसूरान्नं कुजे दद्यात् (D_{12-14})

मसूरांश्च कुजे दद्यात् (D_{3-6})

अस्य स्थाने—

गुडौदनं च भौमाय (N_1—नेवारीकोशे)

अङ्गारकाय संयावं (मत्स्य०, ९३।१९, केषुचित् तत्कोशेषु च)

(२) 'नमः' योगे सप्तमी—

प्रणवे ऋग्यजुः साम्ने ... तुभ्यं मन्त्रात्मने नमः।

(मत्स्य०, ४७।१५८)

[अत्र '०साम्ने', '०त्मने' इत्युभयत्र चतुर्थीविभक्तौ एकारान्तत्वात् तद्ध्वनिसाम्याय 'प्रणवे' इत्यत्रापि सप्तमीविभक्तेर् एकारान्तं रूपं समाश्रितमिति संभावना वर्तते। तथा सति विभक्तिव्यत्ययोऽत्र उपेक्षितः। अनेन छन्दोभङ्गोऽप्यत्र परिहृतो भवति।]

(३) प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि विभक्तिरूपाणि*

"मागधानां महावीर्यो विश्वस्फाणिर्भविष्यति।
उत्साद्य पार्थिवान् सर्वान् सोऽन्यान् वर्णान् करिष्यति॥
कैवर्त्तान् पञ्चकांश्चैव पुलिन्दान् ब्राह्मणांस्तथा।
स्थापयिष्यति राजानो नानादेशेषु ते जनाः।
विश्वस्फाणिर्महासत्त्वो युद्धे विष्णुसमो बली"[२०]

(वायु०, ९९।३७७-३७८)

[विश्वस्फाणिर् नानादेशेषु ते जना (= तान् जनान्, कैवर्त्तादीन्) राजानो (= राज्ञः, द्वितीयाबहुवचनम्) स्थापयिष्यति—इत्यन्वयः। अत्र यद्यपि ब्रह्माण्डे (३।७४।१९२) 'स्थापयिष्यन्ति' इति बहुवचनपाठो विद्यते, तथा वायुपुराणस्य वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणेऽपि (उत्तरा०, अ० ३७, श्लो० ३७३ पू०) 'स्थापयिष्यन्ति राजानो नानादेशेषु तेजसा' इति पाठः परिवर्त्तितः, तथाप्यत्र प्रकरणे 'स्थापयिष्यति' इत्येकवचनमेव साधु, 'विश्वस्फाणिः' इति कर्त्रा तस्यान्वयात्। पुनश्च, विष्णुपुराणे (४।२४।६१-६३ ; जी० वि० संस्करणं ४।२४।१७, १८) तथा भागवतपुराणे (१२।१।३६, ३७) अत्र प्रकरणे 'स्थापयिष्यति' इत्येकवचनपाठ एव वर्तते। अतः, ब्रह्माण्डपुराणे वायुपुराणस्य वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे च बहुवचनपाठो भ्रममूलकत्वात् प्रामादिक एव, तत्र 'राजानो' इत्यनेन तस्य मिथ्यान्वयात्। वस्तुतस्तु, 'राजानो', 'ते', 'जना' इति त्रीण्यपि पदानि प्राकृतद्वितीयाबहुवचनरूपाण्येव, प्राकृते प्रायेण प्रथमा-

* अस्य अंशस्याधारः प्रधानतः पार्जिटरकृतः 'पुराण टैक्स्ट ऑफ दि डाइनेस्टीज़ ऑफ दि कलि-एज' नामको ग्रन्थः, विशेषतस्तु तस्य परिशिष्ट (१) भागः।

२०. द्र०—पार्जिटर, 'पु० टै०', पृ० ५२। प्राचीनकोशानाम् आधारेण पार्जिटरमहोदयैः स्वीकृतोऽयं पाठः।

द्वितीययोः समानरूपत्वात् । पुराणेषु च संस्कृतेऽपि प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि त्रीण्यपीमानि पदानि तथैव प्रयुक्तानि । अतोऽत्र संस्कृतविभक्तिषु प्राकृतप्रभावः स्पष्टः । परवर्तिभिश्च लेखकैरिमं प्राकृतप्रभावमविज्ञायैव नाना पाठभेदा अत्रोद्भाविताः ।[२१]]

अथ मगधराजानो भवितारो वदामि ते । (भागवत०, ६।२२।४५ उ)

[अत्र तु स्पष्टमेव पालिप्राकृतस्य प्रभावो लक्ष्यते । पालिप्राकृते द्वितीयायां बहुवचने 'राजन्' शब्दस्य 'राजानो', 'भवितृ' शब्दस्य च 'भवितारो' इति रूपं भवति । एतादृशः प्रयोगस् तत्रैव साधुः । संस्कृते त्वीदृशो वाक्यविन्यासः सर्वथैवापाणिनीयः]

राजा घोषस्ततश्चापि वर्षाणि भविता त्रयः । (ब्रह्माण्ड०, ३।७४।१५३ उ)

[अत्र प्रकरणे वायुपुराणेऽपि (९९।३४०) 'वर्षाणि भविता त्रयः' इत्येव पाठो वर्तते । 'त्रि' संस्कृतशब्दस्य प्राकृते प्रथमाद्वितीययोस्त्रिषु लिङ्गेषु 'तओ' इति बहुवचनरूपं भवति । अत्र 'त्रयः' इति रूपं 'तओ' इति प्राकृतरूपस्य प्राकृतप्रतिरूपिका संस्कृतच्छायैव । अन्यथा 'वर्षाणि' इत्यस्य योगे 'त्रीणि' इत्येव शुद्धसंस्कृतपाठः स्यात् । वायुपुराणस्यैके कोशे (Jones Ms; W6b, T. 58) अयं पाठ एवं संशोधितः—'त्रीणि वर्षाणि भविता राजा घोषवसुर्नृपः' ।[२२]]

मृगेन्द्रः स्वातिकर्णस्तु भविष्यति समास्त्रयः । (मत्स्य०, २७३ । ७ पू)

[अत्रापि 'त्रयः' शब्दः 'तओ' इति प्राकृतरूपस्य प्राकृतप्रतिरूपा संस्कृतच्छायैव । शुद्धसंस्कृते तु 'समाः' इति विशेष्यस्य योगे तस्य संख्या-विशेषणरूपेण स्त्रियां द्वितीयाबहुवचने 'तिस्रः' इत्येव शुद्धः पाठः स्यात् ।]

अष्टाविंशति तथा वर्षा पालको भविता नृपः । (मत्स्य०, कोशे)[२३]

---

२१. द्र०—पार्जिटर, 'पु० टै०' पृ० ५२, टिप्पण्यः ३३-४२ ।

२२. पार्जिटर, पु० टै०, पृ०, ३२, टि० ३२ । Ms. eVā.

२३. Wilson 21, Auf. Cat. No. 95. द्र०-पार्जिटर, पु० टै०, पृ० १६, टि० २६ ।

['अष्टाविंशति तथा वर्षा (= वर्षाणि)' इति पाठेनात्रानुष्टुप्पादे नवाक्षराणि भवन्ति। प्राकृते तु अस्य स्थाने 'अट्ठावीसं तथा वस्सा' इति पाठो भवति, अनेन प्राकृतपाठेन च पादेऽस्मिन् अष्टाक्षराण्येव भवन्ति। अतो मूलपाठस्तु प्राकृते एव निबद्ध आसीदिति पार्जिटरमहोदयस्य मतम्।[२४] संवत्सरवाचकस्य 'वर्ष' शब्दस्य 'वर्षा' इति द्वितीयाबहुवचनरूपं तु 'वस्सा' इति प्राकृतरूपस्य प्रतिरूपमेव। पालिभाषायामपि 'फल' प्रभृतीनाम् अकारान्तनपुंसक-शब्दानां प्रथमाद्वितीययोर्बहुवचने 'फला' 'फलानि' इति द्विविधानि रूपाणि भवन्ति। मत्स्यपुराणस्यानन्दाश्रमसंस्करणे (२७२। ३ उ) अयं पाठः इत्थं संशोधितः प्राप्यते—'अष्टाविंशति वर्षाणि पालको भविता नृपः'। परन्त्वत्रापि 'अष्टाविंशतिं' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'अष्टाविंशति' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठश् छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वार्थं स्वीकृतः।]

अष्टाविंशति मैथिलाः (ब्रह्माण्ड०, ३।७४।१३७; वायु०, ९९।३२४)

[अत्रापि 'अष्टाविंशति' इति पाठः प्राकृतानुसारी; प्राकृते विसर्गस्या-भावात्। पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वकरणायैव अयं पाठोऽत्र गृहीतः।]

वृद्धवाक्यौषधा नूनं कुर्वन्ति किल निर्विषम्। (वामन०, ५ कोशेषु)[२५]

[अत्रापि 'औषध' इत्यकारान्तनपुंसकशब्दस्य 'औषधा' इति प्रथमा बहुवचनरूपं प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकमेव प्रतीयते।[२६] लौकिके संस्कृते तु 'औषधानि' इत्येव साधु। अतएव वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे (वामन०, ९५।७९ ग) 'वृद्ध-वाक्यौषधान्येव' इति संशोधितः पाठ उपलभ्यते।]

---

२४. द्र०-पार्जिटर, पु॰ टै०, पृ० ७८।

२५. काशिराजन्यास-पुराणविभागे संवादितेषु पञ्चसु कोशेषु। वामनपुराणस्य संवादितकोशानां विवरणं 'पुराणम्' भाग ३, अङ्क १, पृ० १३५-१३६ स्थले द्रष्टव्यम्।

२६. पालिभाषायामपि 'फला', 'फलानि, इत्यादीनि द्विविधानि रूपाणि प्रथमा द्वितीययोर् बहुवचने भवन्ति; वेदेऽप्येवम्, यथा 'विश्वा', 'विश्वानि', 'या', 'यानि' इत्यादीनि रूपाणि—इति पूर्वमेवोक्तम्। अतोऽत्र 'औषधा', इत्यादीनि रूपाणि आर्षं (वैदिक) प्रयोगाः—इत्यपि वक्तुं शक्यते।

येहि संस्थाप्यते क्षत्रमैडैक्ष्वाकुकुलं शुभम् । (मत्स्य०, कोशे)[२७]

[अत्र 'येहि' (सं० 'येभिः') इति तृतीयाबहुवचने प्राकृतरूपम् । वेदे इव पालिभाषायां प्राकृते च अकारान्तशब्दस्य तृतीयाबहुवचने भिसन्तं रूपं दृश्यते । लौकिकसंस्कृते तु 'ऐस्'अन्तमेव—इति तु पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । अस्य पाठस्य स्थाने मत्स्यपुराणस्य आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करणे (५०।७४ घ) 'येषु संस्थास्यते तच्च ऐडेक्ष्वाकुकुलं शुभम्' इति पाठ उपलभ्यते ।]

विन्ध्यकानां कुलानान्ते नृपा वैवाहिकास्त्रयः । (ब्रह्माण्ड०, ३।७४।१८६ पू)

[अत्र 'कुलान+अन्ते' इति विच्छेदो युक्तः । 'कुलान' इति 'कुल' शब्दस्य प्राकृते षष्ठी बहुवचनम् ।[२८] यद्यपि ब्रह्माण्डपुराणस्य वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे सम्पादकैः 'विन्ध्यकानां कुलानां ते नृपा वैवाहिकास्त्रयः' इति संशोधितः पाठो दृश्यते । परन्तु वायुपुराणेऽत्र 'विन्ध्यकानां कुलेऽतीते नृपा वै वाहिकास्त्रयः' इति पाठो वर्तते । अतो ब्रह्माण्डेऽपि 'कुलानान्ते' (कुलान+अन्ते) तथा 'वै वाहिकाः' (=वाह्लिकाः) इति पाठ एव भवितुमर्हति ।]

(आ) लिङ्गव्यत्ययः

ये चान्ये म्लेच्छजातयः (वायु०, ९९।२६७ ? ; वेंकटे०, २।३७।२६५ ख)

[अत्र 'जातयः' इत्यस्य विशेषणत्वेन 'याश्चान्या' इति शुद्धः पाठो युक्तः । वायुपुराणस्यैके कोशेऽपि[२९] 'याश्चान्या' इति संशोधितः पाठो वर्तते । मत्स्यपुराणस्य आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करणेऽपि 'ये चान्ये म्लेच्छसंभवाः' (५०।७६ घ) इति संशोधितः पाठो विद्यते ।

पुण्यस्य पुण्यतां कुर्वन् पञ्चस्रोताः सरस्वती । (पद्म०, ५।१८।१३९ पू)

[अत्र 'सरस्वती' इत्यस्य विशेषणत्वेन (विधेयत्वेन) कुर्वन्' इति 'शतृ' प्रत्ययान्तं पुंलिङ्गरूपं सर्वथाऽसाधु । अस्य स्थाने 'कुर्वती' इत्येव प्रयोगः

---

२७. मत्स्यपुराणस्य इंडिया-आफिस-पुस्तकालस्थे E. 3535 संख्यके कोशे । द्र०—पार्जिटर, पु० टै०, पृ० २, टि० १६ ।

२८. द्र०– पार्जिटर, पु० टै०, पृ० ७९ ।

२९. पार्जिटर-eVā (Jones Ms., W 6b, T. 38); द्र०—पार्जिटर, पु० टै०, पृ० ३, टि० ३७ ।

साधुः स्यात् । परन्त्वनेन प्रयोगेण छन्दोभङ्गो जायेत । अतः छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव 'कुर्वन्' इति पाठोऽत्र प्रयुक्तः ।]

४. तिङन्तपदसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) लङि 'अट्', 'आट्' आगमयोरभावः

कुमारं जनयद् विभुः (मत्स्य०, ५०।४४ ख, कोशेष्वपि)

दाशेयी जनयत् सुतम् (तत्रैव, ५०।४९घ, कोशेष्वपि)

पुत्राणां जनयच्छतम् (तत्रैव, ५०।४७घ, कोशेष्वपि)

[अत्र त्रिष्वपि स्थलेषु छन्दोदोषपरिहाराय 'अजनयन्' इति पाठस्य स्थाने 'जनयत्' इति पाठो वर्तते । शारदाकोशे तदनुसारिणि देवनागरीकोशे च 'पुत्रानजनयच्छतम्' इति संशोधितः पाठो वर्तते ।]

पूर्वं या मालिनी भवत् । (मत्स्य०, ...) ?

[अत्र स्वरविवृत्तिपरिहाराय छन्दोदोषनिवारणाय च 'मालिनी अभवत्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'मालिनी भवत्' इति पाठो वर्तते । D_9 कोशे तु 'मालिनी अभूत्' इति पाठो विद्यते, D_8 कोशे च 'मालिनी ह्यभूत्' इति स्वरविवृत्तिरहितः पाठो वर्तते ।]

स्तोत्रमुदीरयत् (वामनपुराणस्य प्रायः सर्वेषु कोशेषु)

[अत्र 'आट्' आगमस्याभावः । वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे (८५।३१घ) 'आट्'आगमयुतः 'स्तोत्रमुदैरयत्' इति संशोधितः पाठो दृश्यते । अयम् आडागमयुतः पाठोऽपि छन्दोदोषरहित एव । परन्तु वामनपुराणस्य प्रायः सर्वेष्वेव कोशेषु (शारदकोशेऽपि) छन्दोदोषप्रसङ्गमन्तरेणापि 'उदीरयत्' इत्येव पाठः प्राप्यते । अत एवायमेव प्राचीनः पाठः ।]

(आ) आत्मनेपदस्य स्थाने परस्मैपदम्

(१) कर्तृवाच्ये—

ते धुन्धुवाक्यं तु निशम्य दैत्याः
प्रोचुर्नंनो विद्यति लोकपालः । (वामन०, ७८।२० पू०)

[अत्र 'इन्द्रवज्रा' वृत्तस्य प्रथमौ द्वौ पादौ 'स्यादिन्द्रवज्रा यदि तौ जगौ गः' इति लक्षणानुसारेण वृत्तस्यास्य सप्तमम् अक्षरं (जगणस्य प्रथमम् अक्षरं) लघु भवति। अतएवात्र छन्दोऽनुरोधेन 'विद्यते' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'विद्यति' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठः सप्तमाक्षरस्य लघुत्वकरणाय समाश्रितः।]

(२) कर्मवाच्ये—

या च सदा दिवि सेव्यति देवैर्
या च सदा भुवि सेव्यति विप्रैः।

(मत्स्य० कोशेषु)

[आनन्दाश्रममुद्रितमत्स्यपुराणस्य ११६।२२७ स्थाने S_1, D_1, D_2, D_3, कोशेष्वयं पाठ उपलभ्यते। अत्र एकादशाक्षरात्मकौ दोधकवृत्तपादौ। दोधकवृत्तस्य च वृत्तरत्नाकरे—'दोधकवृत्तमिदं भभभाद् गौ' इति लक्षणम्। दोधकवृत्तस्य पादे नवमम् अक्षरं लघु भवति भगणस्य तृतीयाक्षरत्वात्। अतः, छन्दोऽनुरोधाद् अत्र दोधकवृत्तस्योभयोरपि पादयोः 'सेव्यते' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने कर्मवाच्येऽपि 'सेव्यति' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठो वर्तते, नवमाक्षरस्य लघुत्व-करणाय।]

चिह्नं भवव्रतानां दृश्यति चेह जन्मनि प्रकटम्। (मत्स्य०, १८३।३८७)

[अत्र 'आर्या' छन्दसः तृतीयचतुर्थपादौ। आर्यायास् तृतीये पादे द्वादश मात्रा भवन्ति। चतुर्थपादे च पञ्चदशमात्राः। इदं लक्षणमनुसृत्यात्र चतुर्थे पादे 'दृश्यते' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने कर्मण्यपि 'दृश्यति' इति पाठः प्रयुक्तः।]

५. 'क्त्वा'ऽन्तसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) समासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशाभावः

['समासेऽनञ्पूर्वे क्त्वो ल्यप्' (पा० ७।१।३७) इति सूत्रे भगवता पाणिनिना भाषायाम् (लौकिकसंस्कृते) उपसर्गपूर्वकाद् धातोः 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य नित्यं 'ल्यप्'(य) आदेशो विहितः। परन्तु पुराणेषु क्वचिद् उपसर्गपूर्वकाद् धातोरपि 'ल्यप्' स्थाने 'क्त्वा' एव दृश्यते। तत्र प्रायेण छन्दोऽनुरोध एव हेतुर्

भवितुमर्हति। प्राकृतप्रभावोऽपि तत्र हेतुरनुमीयते, पालिप्राकृते तादृशानां प्रयोगानां सद्भावात्। अथवा, वैदिकप्रयोगप्रतिरूपकास् तादृशाः प्रयोगाः पुराणेषु वर्तन्ते—इत्यपि वक्तुं सुकरम्। तथापि, पुराणेषु विद्यमाना ल्यबादेशरहिता एते प्रयोगा अपाणिनीया एव, यतः पाणिनिना छन्दस्येव समासेऽपि क्त्वो बाहुल्येन ल्यबादेशाभाव उक्तः, न तु भाषायामिति पूर्वमेव प्रस्तावनायां स्पष्टीकृतम्।]

उदाहरणानि

(१) प्रवर्त्तयित्वा तं सर्वमृषिं वाजसनेयकम्।

(मत्स्य०, ५०।६४ पू, वायु०, ६१।''')

(२) प्रोक्त्वेत्थं वचनं विभो। (वामन०, ६३।७)

प्रोक्त्वेत्थं च सरस्वती (वामन०, ८६।६४)

ॐ नमः शंकरायेति प्रोक्त्वा जग्मुर्हिमालयम्। (वामन०, ५।१२ पू)

(३) शशिप्रभं देववरं त्रिनेत्रं संपूजयित्वा सहितं मृडान्या।

(वामन०, ८४।४१)

(४) आमन्त्रयित्वा यो मोहादन्यं चा०'''। (कूर्म०, २।२२।८)

(५) सर्वं बलं प्रेषयित्वा गङ्गातीरेऽग्निमाविशत्। (ब्रह्म०, १३८।२५ पू)

(६) उत्सादयित्वा क्षत्रं तु क्षत्रमन्यत्करिष्यति। (वायु०, ६६।३८०)

[वायुपुराणे अत्रैव प्रकरणेऽन्यत्र (९९।३७७) 'उत्साद्य पार्थिवान् सर्वान्' इत्यत्र 'उत्साद्य' इति साधुः पाठ एव दत्तः, न तु 'उत्सादयित्वा' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठः, तत्र छन्दोदोषप्रसङ्गाभावात्। 'उत्सादयित्वा' इति पाठे प्राकृतप्रभावोऽपि लक्ष्यते। अत एव वायुपुराणस्यैके कोशे (पार्जिटर—eVā) अस्य स्थाने 'उच्चादयित्वा' इति प्राकृतरूपमेव लिखितमुपलभ्यते।[30] विष्णुपुराणेऽत्रैव 'उत्साद्याखिलक्षत्रजातिम्' इति शुद्धः पाठ एव वर्तते (४।२४।६३)।]

(आ) असमासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशः

[लौकिकसंस्कृते 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशस्तु अनञ्पूर्वे समासे

३०. द्र०—पार्जिटर, पु० टै०, पृ० ५३, टि० ५२। (eVā = Jones MS.; W 6 b, T 38.)

(उपसर्गपूर्वकाद् धातोः) एव भवति। परन्तु पुराणेषु प्राय उपसर्गरहिताद् धातोरपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य ल्यबादेशो दृश्यते। अत्रापि छन्दोऽनुरोध एव मुख्यो हेतुः। प्राकृतप्रभावो वैदिकप्रयोगानुसरणं वाऽपि हेत्वन्तरम् अनुमातुं शक्यते परं तत्तु गौणमेव।

उदाहरणानि

(१) ततः शुक्लाम्बरैः शूर्पं वेष्ट्य संपूजयेत्फलैः। (मत्स्य०, ८१।१८ पू)
" " " वेष्टयित्वार्चयेत्फलैः। (D_1, D_{12})

(२) तदोंकारमयं गृह्य प्रतोदं···। (मत्स्य०, १३३।५७ ; कोशेषु च)
तत्रोंकारं च संगृह्य प्रतोदं···। (Ś —शारदालिपिकोशे)

(३) शिरसा तु ततो वन्द्य मातरं···। (मत्स्य०, १५८।१० पू, कोशेषु च)

(४) पूज्य देवं चतुर्मुखः। (वामन०, ४६।३७)
पूजयित्वा सरस्वतीम्। (तत्रैव, ४०।४)
संपूज्य देववेशं। (तत्रैव, ६३।७६)

(५) तत्रोप्य सुचिरं कालं (वामन०, ७६।८६)
उपोप्य ··· ··· ··· (तत्रैव, ८०।३५)
उषित्वा ··· ··· ··· (मत्स्य०, १८६।३३)

(६) सेव्य पांशुं प्रयत्नेन (वामन०, ४५।२२)

(७) तत्र स्थाप्य हरिर्देवीं (वामन०, ५४।२८)

[एषु उदाहरणेषु 'वेष्ट्य', 'गृह्य', 'वन्द्य', पूज्य', 'उप्य', 'सेव्य' 'स्थाप्य' इति पदानि छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव प्रयुक्तानि। यत्र तु छन्दोभङ्गभीतिर् न विद्यते तत्र 'पूजयित्वा', 'संपूज्य', 'उपोष्य', 'उषित्वा' इत्यादीनि पदान्येव प्रयुक्तानि। 'वेष्ट्य' 'गृह्य' इत्यत्र च कोशेषु 'वेष्टयित्वा', 'संगृह्य' इति संशोधनमपि विद्यते।]

(८) संतोष्य नारायणमर्च्य भक्त्या (वामन, ७६।५)
तमर्चयित्वा विश्वेशं (तत्रैव, ८४।३६)

[पूर्ववद् अत्रापि 'अर्च्य' इत्यपाणिनीयः प्रयोगश् छन्दोऽनुरोधाद् एव। यत्र च तादृश्यपेक्षा न विद्यते तत्र 'अर्चयित्वा' इति साधुरेव प्रयोगो वर्तते। पुनश्च, वामनपुराणस्य वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे ८४।३३ श्लोके 'तमाच्र्य' इति संशोधितः प्रयोगो वर्तते, परन्तु सर्वेषु कोशेष्वत्र 'तमर्च्य' इत्येव पाठो वर्तते। अतो ज्ञायते मूलपाठस्तु 'अर्च्य' इत्येवासीत्, वेंकटेश्वरसम्पादकैश्च तस्य 'आर्च्य' इति निराधारमेव संशोधनं कृतम्।]

पुराणेषु प्रयुक्तानाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगानाम् एतावता विमर्शेन स्पष्टमिदं प्रतीयते यद् एतादृशानां प्रयोगानां सद्भावे तु छन्दोऽनुरोध एव प्रधानो हेतुः ; पुराणेषु प्रायः पद्यभागेष्वेव अपाणिनीयप्रयोगा वर्तन्ते, गद्यभागेषु तु तेषां स्थाने पाणिनीयप्रयोगा एव प्रयुक्ताः, यथा 'उत्सादयित्वा क्षत्रं तु' (वायु०, ३।३८०) इति पद्ये प्रयुक्तस्य 'उत्सादयित्वा' पदस्य स्थाने 'उत्साद्याखिलक्षत्रजातिम्'(विष्णु० ४।२४।६३) इति गद्यांशे 'उत्साद्य' इति पाणिनीयः प्रयोग एव वर्तते। केषुचित् प्रयोगेषु च प्राकृतभाषायाः प्रभावोऽपि स्पष्ट एव। बहूनाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगानां संशोधने च लिपिकारैः संपादकैश्च यः प्रयत्नः कृतः, तेनैतेषां प्रयोगानाम् आर्षत्वं बाधितं भवति; यतः, असाधूनामेव प्रयोगानां संशोधनं क्रियते, न त्वार्षाणाम्। अतः संशोधकानां विचारेष्वपि तेऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगा असाधव एवासन् न त्वार्षाः।

THE SAṄKHYIZATION OF THE EMANATION DOCTRINE SHOWN IN A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF TEXTS*

By

P. Hacker

[महाभारत-शान्तिपर्वणः (C. E.) २२४ अध्याये, मनुस्मृतेः प्रथमेऽध्याये, पुराणेषु च भूतसृष्टिप्रक्रियायाः समानं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते। सर्गप्रतिसर्गात्मकाः पुराणांशाः किरफलमहोदयेन स्वस्मिन् 'पुराण-पञ्चलक्षण' नामके ग्रन्थे त्रिषु विभागेषु विभाजिताः, यथा—TG I (प्रथमो ग्रन्थसमूहः—ब्रह्म०, हरिवंश०, शिव०-धर्मसंहिता, अग्नि-पुराणं च), TG II A/B (द्वितीयो ग्रन्थसमूहः—गरुड०, पद्म०, वाराह०, विष्णु०, मार्कण्डेय०, कूर्म०, ब्रह्माण्ड०, लिङ्ग०, वायुपुराणं च), TG III (मत्स्यपुराणम्) च। प्रस्तुतलेखस्य विदुषा लेखकेन श्री 'पॉल हैकर' महोदयेन मनुस्मृतेः सृष्टिप्रक्रियायाः, TG I पुराणानां च सृष्टिप्रक्रियायास् तुलनात्मकं विवेचनं कस्मिश्चित् पूर्वलेखे कृतम्। अस्मिन् लेखे च तेन महाभा०-शान्तिपर्व (C. E.)-२२४ अध्यायस्य ११-३८ श्लोकेषु, TG II पुराणेषु च प्रोक्ताया भूतसृष्टि-प्रक्रियायाः पाठसमीक्षापूर्वकं विश्लेषणात्मकं गम्भीरं विवेचनं प्रस्तुतम्। अत्र च मनुस्मृत्युक्तसृष्टिप्रक्रियया च तुलनाऽपि यथास्थानं क्रियते।

अस्य लेखस्य प्रथमे भागे शान्तिपर्व (C. E), अ० २२४, श्लोकाः ११-३८ समालोचिताः सन्ति। एषु श्लोकेषु १२-३१पू (पूर्वार्द्ध) श्लोकाः कालविभागं युगधर्मांश्चोपवर्णयन्ति, शेषाश्च ११, ३१उ (उत्तरार्ध)—३८ श्लोकाः पूर्वां सृष्टिं (=भूतसृष्टि) वर्णयन्ति। एषामपि श्लोकानां मध्ये ३२-३४ श्लोकाः प्रक्षिप्ताः। ततश्च, ११, ३१ उ, ३५-३८ श्लोकेषु ब्रह्माख्याद् अव्यक्ताद् अक्षराद् मूलतत्त्वात् व्यक्ताव्यक्तात्मकस्य (म० स्मृ०—सदसदात्मकस्य) महद्भूताख्यस्य मनसः सृष्टिः, ततश्च क्रमाद् आकाशादीनां भूतानां स्वाभाविकी सृष्टिर् वर्ण्यते। इदं वर्णनं च सांख्यसिद्धान्तमनुसरति। भूतानां चेयं सृष्टिः स्वाभाविकी स्वतः एष प्रवर्त्तते, न त्वीश्वरकृता पौरुषेया वा—इत्यत्र शान्तिपर्वविवेचने मन्यते। तथाप्यत्र TG I पुराणेषु प्रतिपादितस्य सृष्टेर् ईश्वरकर्तृकत्व-सिद्धान्तस्य प्रभावोऽप्युपलक्ष्यते; यतः, एषु शान्तिपर्वश्लोकेषु चत्वार

* Reprinted from the WZKSO (Journal of the Indological Institute, University of Vienna), Band V, *1961*, by kind permission.-Ed.

उपक्रमाः संयोज्यन्ते, येषु मध्ये द्वावुपक्रमौ (११, ३२ श्लोकयोः), अपौरुषेयसृष्टिविषयकौ, द्वौ च (३१ पू, ३३-३४) सृष्टेर् ईश्वरकर्तृकत्व-प्रख्यापकौ स्तः। एवम्, शान्तिपर्वणोऽस्मिन्नंशे द्वयोर्विचारधारयो-रेकत्र सम्मेलनं वर्तते।

लेखस्य द्वितीये भागे TG II पुराणानां भूतेन्द्रियसृष्टिवर्णनं विमृश्यते। तत्र TG I। समूहस्य प्रथमे परिच्छेदे सांख्यानुसारिण्येव सृष्टिप्रक्रियोपवर्ण्यते। TG I विभागस्य सप्त (मार्कण्डेय, वायु, ब्रह्माण्ड, कूर्म, लिङ्ग, पद्म, विष्णु) पुराणानि द्वयोः प्रधानविभागयो-र्विभक्तव्यानि —(१) मार्कण्डेयं, (२) वायु-ब्रह्माण्डं च। (पद्मपुराणं विष्णुपुराणं च प्रायेण मार्कण्डेयमेवानुसरतः; कूर्मपुराणं लिङ्ग-पुराणं च वायु-ब्रह्माण्डमनुसरतः)। एषु सप्तसु पुराणेषु भूतसृष्टिप्रक्रियाया वर्णनं प्रायेण समानमेव, परन्तु तत्र षट् भिन्ना उपक्रमा (वायु-ब्रह्माण्डे, कूर्मे, लिङ्गे, मार्कण्डेये, पद्मे, विष्णौ च) वर्तन्ते, न च ते प्रधानवर्णनेन सह संवदन्ति, तेषां सृष्टेरीश्वरकर्तृकत्वप्रतिपादकत्वात्। अतः, एते सर्वे एवोपक्रमाः पश्चात् प्रक्षिप्ता इति विदुषो लेखकस्य मतम्। अस्मिन् TG I-पुराणनां वर्णने शान्तिपर्ववर्णनस्य प्रभावोऽपि स्पष्टः प्रतीयते।]

The following abbreviations are used in this paper :

Bṇ = Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa (Veṅkaṭeśvara Press).
CE = Critical Edition (of Mbh).
JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society.
Kū = Kūrmapurāṇa (Bibliotheca Indica and Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, saṃvat 1983).
L = Liṅgapurāṇa (Calcutta, śakābdāḥ 1812 and 1885 A. D.).
M = Manusmṛti, Chapter I (Nirṇayasāgara edition with Kullūka's commentary).
Mbh = Mahābhārata (quotations according to CE).
Mr = Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa (Bibliotheca Indica and Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, saṃvat 1967).
Pd = Padmapurāṇa (Ānandāśrama Edition).
PP = W. Kirfel, *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*, Bonn, 1927 (References are to pages and verse-numbers, e. g. : PP. 6, 4_2, means verse 4_2 occurring on page 6 of the Purāṇa texts in Kirfel's edition).
Śp = Śāntiparvan of Mbh (quotations according to CE).
TG = Text Group (Textgruppe) of the Sarga-Pratisarga texts in PP.
Vā = Vāyupurāṇa (Ānandāśrama Edition and Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1933 A. D.).
Vi = Viṣṇupurāṇa (Calcutta, 1882 and Gorakhpur [Gītā Press], saṃvat 2009).

Adhyāya 224 of Śp and some passages of M were thoroughly scrutinized from the point of view of the historian of philosophy by Erich Frauwallner as early as 1925, in an article in JAOS, vol. 45, pp. 51—67. A remarkable result of these investigations,

which was later incorporated in Frauwallner's *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (vol. I, Salzburg, 1953, pp. 97ff.), is the discovery that there are pre-Sāṅkhyic texts in Śp. This result has greatly enhanced the importance of the Great Epic as a source, or as the reflection of sources, providing materials for the knowledge of the history of philosophy. The opposition of "philosophy of syncretism or of transition" (Mischphilosophie or Ubergangsphilosophie), which had dominated the discussion about the nature of "the Philosophy of the Epic" among scholars of an earlier generation[1], has been replaced by fresh points of view, and it is no longer justified now to speak of the philosophy of Mbh as of a body of doctrines exhibiting anything like intrinsic unity. The didactic pieces of the epic reflect several currents of thought belonging to different periods of time, from which no other documents are available, and to some extent developments can be traced within the texts themselves.

In the meantime, however, the Critical Edition of the relevant Mbh passages (*Śāntiparvan*, fasc. 22 and 23, Poona, 1951—1952) and W. Kirfel's *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (Bonn, 1927) have appeared. This makes a fresh study of the subject desirable. It may be stated beforehand that this investigation will not cancel Frauwallner's results, but render their significance even more conspicuous by tracing the line of development farther in both directions, towards the past as well as towards later periods, and by analysing more elaborately some aspects of the texts treated by Frauwallner.

For the texts of Śp 224 and M are in a direct genetic line connected with those purāṇic texts the historical development of which, as far as it is traceable in the purāṇas themselves, has been shown by Kirfel in his *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*. In the direction of the past, there is a genetic connection to TG I, as I tried to show in a brief analysis of the cosmogony of the

1. Cp. Paul Deussen : *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam* (Leipzig, 1906), Preface, p. vi; Otto Strauß : *Indische Philosophie* (München, 1924) p. 126.

Manusmṛti in comparison with TG I a few years ago[2]. In the present article, it is proposed to trace the line of development to a later stage, viz. to TG IIA and TG IIB, after first attempting a fresh critical analysis of the Cosmogony Text of Śp 224, utilizing the Critical Edition[3]. The study is limited to the account of the elemental emanation as given in Śp 224 and the exposition of the emanation of the elements and senses as set forth in TG IIA/IIB, all matter after Śp 224, 38 and after PP 50, 45b (or PP 9, 20, respectively) being reserved for future investigations.

I. The Account of Emanation of Śp 224

Śp 224, 11 (quoted below, p. 303) describes the nature of the primeval entity. Immediately afterwards, the subject changes. The following verses, 12—31 b, have no direct bearing on the contents of 11, treating as they do of Divisions of Time (12—21 and 28—30) and of the *Dharmas* of the *Yugas* (22—27). After 30, the subject of Cosmogony is resumed.

Up to Śp 224, 38 there are parallel passages in M :

12—21 correspond to M 64—70 (Divisions of Time);

22—27 correspond to M 81—86 (*Yugadharmāḥ*);

28—38 correspond to M 71—78 (conclusion of the tract on Divisions of Time and Cosmogony).

The different arrangement of the several subjects in Mbh and M already suggests that neither M nor Mbh has used the other text, but both have drawn upon a common source, nay, several sources, viz, a short text on Divisions of Time, another one on *Yugadharmāḥ*, and a third one on Cosmogony—and that the

2. *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*, in: *Jñānamuktāvalī*, Commemoration Volume in Honour of Johannes Nobel (New Delhi, 1959), pp. 77ff. For lack of space, this article had to be very brief, and the comparison of M with Mbh 12, 231–232 could be given only in a very summary way. Besides, I eventually forgot, though I originally intended, to refer to Frauwallner's article in JAOS, vol. 45, a reference which would have been especially useful for the explanation of the verses M 16–19 (see pp. 80f. of my article in *Jñānamuktāvalī* and pp. 57f. of Frauwallner's article in JAOS, vol. 45).

3. CE 12, 224, 11–12 is Bombay Edn. 12, 231, 11–12; CE 12, 224, 13 is B.E. 13–14; CE 12,224, 14–31 is B.E. 15–32; CE 12,224, 32–38 is B.E. 12, 232, 1–7,

redactors of Śp and M have pieced them together in different ways. The observation of two interruptions in the course of exposition raises this supposition almost to certainty: (1) The verse Śp 224, 11, which gives a description of the primeval being or the primeval state of the world, is evidently meant as an introduction to the narration of the cosmogonic process, but the subject is resumed only with 31; (2) the tract on Divisions of Time is cut short with 21, but abruptly resumed in 28, an interruption which is absent in M. These breaks in the continuity of the narration as well as the difference of arrangement in Mbh and in M are incompatible with the assumption that the text had from the outset formed a coherent whole. In placing the introductory verse of the cosmogonic narration (11) at the beginning of the whole passage, i. e. by indicating the third subject before treating the first and second ones, the redactor of Śp 224 evidently meant to bind together more closely the three subjects which he wanted to connect into a whole, and to do this by using the very words of his sources, without adding links of his own invention.

The sources used by the redactor were small tracts which had had an independent existence and had presumably been used for purposes of instruction even before they were incorporated into the epic. Such tracts can be traced in other texts of the anonymous Sanskrit literature also. We will call them Short Instructional Tracts (German: Kleine Lehrstücke) or simply Short Tracts. One text of this kind is e. g. preserved, with enlargements, in TG I (see my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*); another one is the account of Viṣṇu's *prādurbhāvas* in Mbh 3, 272 (see my book *Prahlāda* [Mainz, 1959], p. 25—26 with footnote on p. 26; a third instance—the Sāṅkhya Text of TG IIA/IIB—will be dealt with in section II of this article.

Thus we may say that three Short Tracts—on Divisions of Time, on *Yugadharmāḥ*, and on Cosmogony—are united in Śp 224. In this article we will consider only the text Emanation of the Elements, on what is called *pūrvā sṛṣṭiḥ* in Śp 224, 38d, leaving over for future treatment other texts of Śp 224.

Textual criticism affords some precious data regarding the history of the initial verses of this Short Tract. These verses, including Śp 224, 11, run as follows :

11. *anādy-antam ajaṃ divyam ajaraṃ dhruvam avyayam*
apratarkyam avijñeyaṃ brahmâgre samavartata.
(v. l. : *sampravartate*)

31. *pratibuddho vikurute brahmâkṣayyaṃ kṣapā-kṣaye*
sṛjate ca mahad bhūtaṃ tasmād vyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ.
(v. l. *vyaktâvyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ*).

32. *brahma tejomayaṃ śukraṃ yasya sarvam idaṃ jagat*
(v. l. : *rasaḥ*)
ekasya bhūtaṃ bhūtasya dvayaṃ sthāvara-jaṅgamam

33. *ahar-mukhe vibuddhaḥ san sṛjate'vidyayā jagat*
agra eva mahābhūtam āśu vyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ.

34. *abhibhūyêha cârciṣmad vyasṛjat sapta mānasān*
dūragaṃ bahudhāgāmi prārthanā-saṃśayâtmakam.
(Variant readings have been noted, here as elsewhere, only if they are of importance for the discussions of this article).

33–34 are lacking in one manuscript (of the Devanāgarī Composite Version)[3a], and in 3 southern manuscripts as well as in the Kumbhakonam edition the verses 35–38 (quoted below, p. 309) appear after 31 CE for the first time and are then repeated after 34 CE. Moreover the awakening of the Creator and the creation of the *manas* are mentioned twice (in 31 and 33). These facts safely indicate that in manuscripts or oral traditions different attempts had been made to commence the cosmogonic narration and that the initial verses of different traditions were more or less mechanically juxtaposed by the redactors of the Śp. text. One of these traditions made the account of cosmogony, after the introductory verse 11 and the intervening tracts, begin with 31 ; this must have been the oldest way of beginning the account after it had been combined

3a. One MS of the Northern recension (Kāśmīrī version) omits 32c–33b, but this seems to be a case of haplography due to the fact that both 32b and 33b end with *jagat* in that MS.

with the two preceding tracts, since 31 occurs in all manuscripts. The 3 southern manuscripts and the Kumbhakonam edition testify to that old tradition in which 32–34 were lacking, but the compiler of that version knew also the younger tradition which included those verses, and in order to do justice to both, he mechanically juxtaposed their readings, first omitting 32–34, but then, after 38, giving the whole account once again, with the inclusion of 32–34. The one manuscript of the Devanāgarī Composite Version, however, which omits 33–34, seems to point to a tradition in which 32 had already been inserted, while 33-34 were still lacking. The text of the majority of the manuscripts, however, juxtaposes four different beginnings of the account: one is 11, a verse which is here used as an introduction to the whole tract in which three Short Texts (on Divisions of Time, on *Yugadharmāḥ*, and on Cosmogony) are united; the second one is 31 a—b, a half verse which tries to connect the preceding tract on Divisions of Time with the following on Cosmogony; the third one is 32; the fourth one is 33 (—34).

This practice of juxtaposition, which is a primitive method of redaction, caused by the desire of doing equal justice to different traditions, is not traceable in the Cosmogony of Śp 224 only, but can be observed in other texts of the epics and purāṇas also. In the Rāmāyaṇa, e.g., one and the same subject is sometimes treated several times in slightly different ways in successive sargas. Another instance is the initial part of PP, TGI, in which at least two different beginnings, PP 2, 3 and 3, 10, can be distinguished (cp. my *Two Acconnts of Cosmogony*). In the beginnings of short texts that had originally had an independent existence, this practice has sometimes led to a state which may at first sight be figuratively and approximately depicted as frayed. There are, as it were, various loose threads at the fore-edge of the fabric of the text. The textual condition which we have described as juxtaposition of different traditions, may of course as well be characterized as interpolation or addition of parts of later versions or traditions to the original,

i.e., to use the figurative expression: not all of the loose threads originally belonged to the tissue. The critic has to examine which one of them has a continuous connexion with the tissue and which have been secondarily attached to it. Thus it will be our task to analyse in detail the four different beginnings of the Short Tract on Cosmogony contained in Śp 224.

We have also to bear in mind that in the case of ancient Short Tracts the affixing of additional beginnings may be due to the intention of modernizing the texts. Thus in TG I the insertion of the verse PP 2, 3 was evidently caused by the desire of adapting the ancient account to cosmogonic ideas of the Sāṅkhya system. It may even be stated as a law governing the transmission of instructional texts, that the bulk of an old Short Tract is handed down unaltered or with minor changes only, but the introduction to it is at times remodelled to adapt the whole text to later views or to a new context. This is sometimes, as in the case of the cosmogony of Śp 224, done by the insertion of additional initial verses (which perhaps belonged originally to other, later texts), sometimes by other means as we shall see in the case of TG IIA/IIB.

Let us now examine the first introductory verse (11) of the account of elemental emanation:

> *anādy-antam ajaṃ divyam ajaraṃ dhruvam avyayam*
> (v. l.: *avyaktam ajaraṃ dhruvam*)
> *apratarkyam avijñeyaṃ, brahmâgre samavartata*
> (v. l.: *saṃpravartate*).

This verse conceives of the entity that existed before the origin of the constituents of the world, as an impersonal being, which is called *brahman* as in early upaniṣads. The attributes by which it is here characterized give no indication as to whether the *brahman* is a spiritual being or something like primary matter. Its most prominent quality is its permanence. which is described by no less than five adjectives *anādyanta, aja, ajara, dhruva, avyaya*), Besides, its supermundane nature (*divya*) and unknowability (*apratarkya, avijñeya*) are mentioned.

A variant, attested by 11 manuscripts, replaces *avyayam* by *avyaktam* and changes the arrangement of the words for the sake of the metre. This alteration is of course due to the tendency, so often observable in the anonymous literature, of modernizing an ancient text by the introduction of ideas or terms that had become fashionable at a later time, and it makes the *brahman* similar to the primary matter which is denoted by the term *avyaktam* in Sāṅkhya.

An approximate parallel is found at M 5 :

āsīd idaṃ tamo-bhūtam aprajñātam alakṣaṇam
apratarkyam avijñeyaṃ prasuptam iva sarvataḥ.

In this verse the designation of the primeval entity or primeval state as *brahman* is eliminated, and the attribute *prasupta*, which originally, of course, referred to the personal *Creator* immersed in his cosmic sleep, is assigned to the pre-creational state of the *world*, whereas, on the other hand, the attribute *avyakta*, which originally denoted primary matter or the world in the state of dissolution, is in the following verse (M 6) assigned to the personal Creator—two interesting cases of exchange between impersonalism and personalism.—Two words of the Śp text, viz *apratarkyam* and *avijñeyam*, are confirmed by M 5.

The whole verse, Śp 224, 11, recurs, with significant variants, in Bḍ, Kū, L, Mr, and Vā (PP 46, 10), cp. below, pp. 317 ff. The imperfect tense *samavartata*[4] is seemingly confirmed by

4 The reading *samāvartata* (with *ā*) found in PP is an error, all Purāṇa edttions I could consult having *samavartata*. By the way, it may be noted here that the sentence *brahmâgre sampravartate* had a long history starting from one of the later hymns of the Ṛgveda and extending at least to the time of the great Vedānta teacher Śaṅkara (7th–8th century A. D.). Ṛgveda 10, 121, 1 begins with the words *Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ samavartatâgre*. Here the imperfect tense is used, and the subject of the verb is a personal being, not an impersonal entity. Whether *samavartata* means *began to move*, or *existed* or *arose*, is not quite clear. Śaṅkara (Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 1. 2. 23) took it in the latter sense (*samavartatêty ajāyatêty arthaḥ*). The pāda Śp 224, 11 d was obviously modelled on the pattern of that Ṛgveda sentence, but the verb was taken in the sense *begins to work*, which was rendered clearer by the addition o the second prefix *-pra-*; at the same time, the tense was changed into the present (to suggest the idea of cyclic recurrence) and what was the most important change, the subject of the verb was no longer

four of these purāṇa texts, but is certainly not original. For the whole of the following account, at least those of its verses which are incontestably original, are in the present tense. Therefore, *saṃpravartate,* which is attested by 11 manuscript texts and one marginal note. has to be preferred. Moreover, this form makes better sense. For *samavartata* may suggest the idea of origination, which, however, is excluded by the preceding attributes "without beginning or end" and "unborn." *saṃpravartate,* on the other hand, can more easily be understood to mean *begins to work.* The substitution of the imperfect for the present tense, in Śp as well as in the purāṇas, is easily explainable from the fact that the text treats of an event which, though imagined as cyclically recurring, is also conceived of as having happened in the past.

After the introductory verse 11 and after the intervening verses that treat of other subjects than cosmogony, the exposition of the process of emanation starts with 31 (quotation above) The verses 31—34 are in a curious state of confusion. We have already seen that there are strong grounds—manuscript testimony as well as repetitions in the contents—for rejecting 32—34 as unoriginal. We will consider these verses below. As for 31, I am inclined to regard its first half as an attempt to connect the account of emanation with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time and at the same time to mention a personal Creator; so this half verse did not possibly form part of the original Short Tract on Cosmogony either. The continuation of this tract, which began with 11, might fittingly have been the second half of 31 (*sṛjate ca mahad bhūtam ...*), and

the personal *Hiraṇyagarbha* but the impersonal *brahman.* The MSS of Śp and the purāṇas that changed *saṃpravartate* into *samavartata* did so probably under the influence of the old Ṛgveda verse. The subject of the verb, in PP 56, 10 remained the impersonal *brahman.* But afterwards, in the same purāṇic tract, the sentence once more occurs (PP 51, 58), and at that place the context makes it clear that here the personal *Brahmā,* not *brahma,* is meant : *ādikartā ca bhūtānāṃ Brahmâgre samavartata,* and under the influence of this passage, the redactor of Vā-Bd understood *Brahmā* at PP 46, 10 also, cp. below, p. 322. So the history, extending over more than a thousand years, of the old ṛgvedic sentence reflects continual fluctuations between a personalistic and an impersonalistic conception of the Highest Being.

after this, 35 might have followed (*quotation below*, p. 309). I think there are strong reasons for the assumption that the beginning as well as the continuation of the account of emanation (11 and 31 c—d, respectively) must have been of an impersonalistc tendency. For the continuation of the emanation is an evolutionary process, in which every entity evolves from the preceding one more or less mechanically, without the intervention of a directing person; this suggests that the first stage also happened without the activity of a person. The idea of discharging or emitting out of one's self (*sṛjate*, 31 c) need not necessarily refer to the conception of a personal Creator. The *ātmanepada* is doubtless significant. It stresses the impersonal, mechanical character of the process, whereas in the originally theistic cosmogony of TG I the *parasmaipada* (*sasarja, asṛjat*: PP 3, 10. 14; 4, 15. 18) is used to express real action of a person. The *ātmanepadas* of *vi-kṛ*, *vikurute* and *vikurvāṇa*, which occur in the sequel (cp. the quotation of 35—38 below, p. 309), suggest the same idea of a mechanical process. In 35, *manaḥ sṛṣṭiṃ vikurute* does not mean that the Mind "differentiates" a "creation" already in existence, but the idea is that the Mind *differentiates itself*, i.e., *gets into a process of differentiation*, as the result of which the emanation (*sṛṣṭi*) arises; so *sṛṣṭim* is an effected, not an affected, object. On the other hand, in 31 the *ātmanepada* form *vikurute* is construed with an affected object (*akṣayyam*), and this difference from 35 in the use of the *ātmanepada* form *vikurute* also tells against the originality of the first half of 31. The *ātmanepada* participle *vikurvāṇa*, which occurs three times in 36—38, again expresses the idea of *differentiating oneself* or *falling into a process of differentiation.*—The notion of the "desire to create" (*sisṛkṣā*), which is attributed to the *Manas* in 35, implies partial personification only. It is certainly a reminiscence of the ancient theistic cosmogony of TG I, in which the Creator begins his work because he is "desirous to create" (*sisṛkṣu*, PP 3, 10). But this influence has not substantially altered the essentially mechanical character of the emanation process as described in Śp 224, for as the ether "is born" or

"arises" from the *manas*, so each of the following elements "arises" from the preceding one. If the process had in the original account started with an action of a personal Creator, one would expect that afterwards the Creator should personally create the products of creation or at least arrange for their being created, as he does in the purely theistic tract of TG I (cp. my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*). Moreover, as we have seen above (p. 306) in examining a verse of the Manusmṛti, impersonalistic or mechanistic attributes were interchangeable with personalistic or theistic ones. It is the general tenor of an account of cosmogony that allows to determine it as theistic or impersonalistic, and this tenor is clearly impersonalistic in the case of the cosmogony of Śp 224 once the interpolations are eliminated. The original form of this Short Tract belongs to a current of thought different from that of which the tract of TG I is representative, but concordant with the thought of some impersonalistic texts of the early upaniṣads.

So there is some probability of the whole account of emanation having originally run approximately like this:

> *anādy-antam ajaṃ divyam ajaraṃ dhruvam avyayam*
> *apratarkyam avijñeyaṃ brahmâgre saṃpravartate* (11)
> *sṛjate ca mahad bhūtaṃ tasmād vyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ* (31c—d).
> (v. l.: *vyaktâvyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ*)
>
> *manaḥ sṛṣṭiṃ vikurute codyamānaṃ sisṛkṣayā*
> *ākāśaṃ jāyate tasmāt tasya śabdo guṇo mataḥ* (35)
> *ākāśāt tu vikurvāṇāt sarva-gandha-vahaḥ śuciḥ*
> *balavāñ jāyate vāyus tasya sparśo guṇo mataḥ* (36)
> *vāyor api vikurvāṇāj jyotir bhūtaṃ tamo-nudam*
> *rociṣṇu jāyate tatra tad rūpa-guṇam ucyate* (37)
> *jyotiṣo 'pi vikurvāṇād bhavanty āpo rasātmikāḥ*
> *adbhyo gandha-guṇā bhūmiḥ pūrvâiṣā sṛṣṭir ucyate* (38)

The whole account is in the present tense, probably because the process of cosmogony is imagined as repeating itself at the beginning of every aeon, not as happening once only. 35—38 almost literally agree with M 75—78.

In 31 d there is an important *varia lectio*, attested by 3 manuscripts, viz. *vyaktâvyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ* instead of *tasmād vyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ*. This reading would suggest that the *manas* is the *mahad bhūtam* and is not evolved from another entity called *mahad bhūtam*. The *manas* would thus be the first product of evolution, which would correspond to an earlier stage of development of the doctrine and also accord with the cosmogony of M 74—78. The epithet *vyaktâvyaktâtmaka*, which is contained in the variant, means more or less the same as *sad-asad-ātmaka*, which characterizes the *manas* in M 74 :

tasya so 'har-niśasyânte prasuptaḥ pratibudhyate
pratibuddhaś ca sṛjati manaḥ sad-asad-ātmakam[5].

I am inclined to regard the reading *vyaktâvyaktâtmakam* as original. Later, the *manas* was certainly considered to belong to the evolved state of things, a view which is attested in our text by 33 : *āśu vyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ*. But at an earlier stage, it would not be so well intelligible why the *manas* should have been called *vyaktâtmaka*, especially if it is probable that the text of 11 had not originally contained the word *avyaktam*. The attribute *vyaktâvyaktâtmakam*—as well as *sad-asad-ātmakam* in M—, on the other hand, is easily explainable from the fact that the *manas* is intermediate between the inconceivable *brahman* and the products of creation, which are "made asunder" (i.e. rendered *vyakta*) by the *manas*.

In the remaining verses of the original Short Tract. 35–38 there are several variants, some of which, while at the same time concordant with M, are attested by numerous Mbh

5 This Manu verse is another attempt, besides those traceable in Śp 224, of giving a new introduction to the ancient Short Tract (which had once had an independent existence). It was obviously composed with the intention (1) of connecting the subsequent account of Cosmogony with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time, and (2) of replacing the original beginning, with the impersonal *brahman*, by a mention of a personal Creator. Its ideas point to an early period, when the Sāṅkhya had not yet become popular and *manas* still was the first product of cosmogony. The impersonalistic initial verse of the ancient Short Tract has been placed in M at the beginning of the first account of Cosmogony (M 5), but has been thoroughly modified, only one pāda having been retained from the ancient verse (cp. above, p. 306).

manuscripts, but none of them implies a notable change of ideas; it is therefore not necessary to discuss them here.

As for the philosophical contents of the verses, the reader is referred to Frauwallner's article in JAOS, 1925.

There is a second impersonalistic beginning in our text, viz. verse 32. The verse is difficult. As it stands it seems to mean :—

> "*Brahman* is the fiery seed, the one being of which (*yasya... ekasya bhūtasya*) the whole of this world, consisting of immobile (inanimate) and mobile (animate) beings, is (or : has become) a double."

But there is a remarkable variant, viz. *rasaḥ* (*rasam* in one MS) instead of *jagat*. This reading is attested by 14 manuscripts of the Northern and Southern recensions[6] and is evidently the *lectio difficilior*; so it deserves special notice. The verse recurs at Śp 232, 9 (Bombay edition : 240, 9)[7], and the reading *rasaḥ* is attested by all manuscripts of that passage. The verse may have had a sort of independent existence, at least it must have been felt to be very impressive as it was quoted in various contexts—like other impressive verses, as e.g. PP (TG I), 2, 3a—b, which recurs at TG II B, PP 45, 7c—d, right side; and PP 3, 11, which recurs several times in the anonymous literature. Textual criticism has to find out the original context of such verses—which is a difficult task as long as we do not have word indexes or at least pāda or verse indexes to all works of the anonymous literature. As regards the verse in question, neither Śp 224 nor Śp 232 seems to be its original context. It may or may not originally have formed the initial verse of a cosmogonic account.—If in this verse *rasaḥ* is substituted for *jagat*, the meaning seems to be that "the universe (*sarvam idam*) is the essence of *brahman*". But the idea of this sentence[8] is hard to understand. It would

6 5 of these MSS, 3 additional MSS, and the commentary of Vidyāsāgara have *brahma-bhūtasya* instead of *bhūtaṃ bhūtasya*, but this seems negligible.

7 The recurrence was not noticed by the editor of Śp in CE, so he did not utilize it in establishing the text of 224, 32.

8 The idea is also suggested by the editors of the new edition of Apte's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s. v. *rasa*, meaning 15.

amount to an excess of pantheism or even materialistic monism : the essence of the Absolute is the World. Anyhow, we have at least to reckon with the possibility that there was such a philosophy in ancient India, and to wait until other contexts afford further elucidation. The idea must have been unintelligible or offensive to an early redactor ; so he replaced *rasaḥ* by *jagat*[9]. It is tempting to translate *rasa* by *discharge* or *secretion*, a meaning which would be easily derivable from the original sense *juice* ; the passage would then mean that the universe was a discharge of the seed which is *brahman*, but I cannot vouch for the existence or possibility of this meaning.

So the verse would mean : "*Brahman* is the fiery seed of which the universe, inanimate and animate, is the essence (or : of which the universe is the discharge—?) ; (the universe) is a double of (that) one being."

In translating *dvayam* by "a double", I have in mind the meaning of *dvaita*, which, as long observation of many texts has taught me, rarely means *duality* or *dualism*, but mostly the *state of there being a second one (a double)*. This signification presupposes a noun which, if it has several meanings, must at least in one of them signify *a double, something which appears as a second one beside an original or essential unity*, and if there is such a noun it can only be *dvaya*.

Instead of taking *brahma tejomayaṃ śukram* to be a nominal sentence (with *bhavati* to be supplied), it would also be possible, in the context of Śp 224, to construe *sṛjate* in the preceding half verse as a predicate of which *brahma*, with *tejomayaṁ śukram* as an apposition, would be the subject : "*Brahman*, the fiery seed, creates (i. e. discharges out of its self) the Great Being, the *Manas*, which is evolved and unevolved..." But this construction would be secondary, as it is rendered possible only through the juxtaposition method of the Śp redactor.

9 Deussen's translation of the verse (*Vier philosophische Texte......*; 240, 9c—10=CE 232, 9) offers no acceptable solution. He makes *brahma-tejomayam* a compound. reads *śukla* instead of *śukra*, and translates *yasya sarvam idaṃ rasaḥ* by *dessen Geschmack dieses Weltall an sich hat*, i. e., he takes *rasa* to mean something like *taste-bearer*, a meaning which does not seem to be attested anywhere.

If the cosmogonic account which is preserved in Śp 224, originally started from an impersonal Absolute, the personalistic, i. e. theistic conception which is represented by TG I (and the roots of which can also be traced to some texts of the brāhmaṇas and early upaniṣads) must have soon influenced the impersonalistic text. The influence began, as we have seen p. 308, by taking over the notion of *sisṛkṣā*. But then, several other attempts were made to introduce theism into the text by making the cosmogony start from a masculine being. One of them is represented by Śp 224, 31 a—b (a half verse with which 31 c—d, which probably belonged to the original, impersonalistic text, was combined into a sentence), a second one by 33 (with which 34c—d is to be connected), and a third one by M 74 (which is very similar to Śp 224, 31 ; see the quotation above, p. 310 with footnote). All the three beginnings include the idea that the Creator awakes from his cosmic sleep, and this idea at the same time establishes connexion with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time, which concludes with mentioning the cosmic day and night.

In 31 b, *brahmâkṣayyam* is only understandable if it is dissolved into *brahmā akṣayyam* (for otherwise there would be no masculine noun to which *pratibuddho* would refer and which could be made the subject of *sṛjate*), and *akṣayyam* (the same word which was introduced by later versions into the verse of Śp 224. 11 as an attribute of *brahman* which is a sort of primary matter; cp. below, p. 319). must mean something like primary matter, so that the sentence would mean : "Having awoken at the end of the night, *Brahmā* differentiates (makes asunder) the Imperishable."

In 33 it is once more stated that the Creator, having awoken, created the *Manas*, "the quick one, of evolved nature". The *manas* is here evidently identical with the *mahābhūtam*. So this verse testifies to the existence of the view of the *manas* as a *mahābhūtam* or *mahad bhūtam* (this reading is in 21 MSS of several versions); accordingly, if the same view, which is certainly ancient, was originally expressed by 31 also, the reading *tasmād vyaktâtmakaṃ manaḥ* (which implies that the *mahad bhūtam* is the origin of, not identical with, the *manas*) has to be rejected in 31, and the only

alternative afforded by the manuscript material is *vyaktâvyaktâtmakam.* 33 would thus agree with the original text of 31 in the view that the *manas is* the Great Being, the first product of creation, but differ from it in so far as the *manas* is described as evolved, no longer as evolved-and-unevolved.

The text of 33b is ambiguous in the word *vidyayā,* which may stand for *avidyayā,* according to sandhi rules. The commentaries quoted by the editor of CE all understand *avidyayā,* and this seems in fact to be the probable reading, though the editor of CE preferred *vidyayā. vidyayā,* in this context would mean something like *by a spell,* or the word would refer to the Creator's knowledge of the karman of the several beings, in accordance with which their new existence is shaped (cp. *prāṇinām karma-vipakam viditvā* in the cosmogony of Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṃgraha[10]). But I would prefer to read *avidyayā,* which is well in concord with texts of purāṇic Sāṅkhya as well as later Vedānta, cp., e.g. *the abuddhi-pūrvakaḥ*[11] *sargaḥ* of PP 20, 1. So the idea is that the Creator utilized Nescience, a dull, gloomy, de-spiritualizing force, in creating the material world.

Verse 34 is puzzling. Its second half evidently gives a characterization of the *manas,* which was mentioned at the end of 33, describing it as "far-going, moving in manifold ways, consisting of desire and doubt"; this half verse seems to be a late accretion. But to this addition, a second interpolation was added by another redactor, who was induced by that harmonizing tendency which has been so effective in the history of purāṇic texts, to insert a reminiscence of the ancient cosmogony of TG I: Śp 224, 34b (*vyasṛjat sapta mānasān*; v. l. *asṛjat...*) is almost identical with PP 4, 16d (*so 'sṛjat sapta mānasān*). In accordance with the text of TG I, the subject of *vyasṛajat* should be the Creator himself, so that 34a—b would mean: "Having here overpowered the Flaming One (i. e. the Great

10. The *abhidhyāna* or *cintana* practised by the Creator in the act of creation (two instances, out of many, are PP 20, 1 and M 8) is of course quite a different thing from *vidyā.*

11. In the parallel passage, PP 62, 26, the reading should also be *abuddhi-,* not *buddhi-.*

Being, the *manas*), he created seven *Mānasas*." It is interesting that the *manas* is conceived of as a bright substance. The overpowering of this substance is probably to be understood to mean that the Creator forced the *manas* to discharge the *Mānasas* as its offspring. The whole idea is entirely foreign to the rest of the cosmogonic account of Śp 224, nay, it is understandable only if the parallel of PP 4, 16 (to which parallels from M can be added) is utilized for explanation.

To recapitulate, we may state that the cosmogony of Śp 224 has four juxtaposed introductions, two of which are mechanistic (11 and 32), the two others being theistic (31a—b and 33, to which 34c–d and 34a–b are two successive additions).

The first mechanistic introduction, verse 11, is most probably the original one. It describes the premundane states as the *brahman*, which is "without beginning or end, unborn, supermundane, undecaying, stable, imperishable, inconceivable, unknowable", and which "starts moving in the beginning".

The second mechanistic introduction (32) also speaks of the *brahman*, but it is here conceived of as "a fiery seed, of which the universe is the essence (or: the discharge—?); the one being of which the world, animate and inanimate, is a double."

The first theistic introduction (31a—b) calls the Creator *Brahmā* and says that, "having awoken at the end of the (cosmic) night, he differentiates the Imperishable", by which word primary matter is signified here.

The second theistic introduction (33—34) says that (the Creator), "having awoken at the beginning of the (cosmic) day, creates the world through Nescience: first (he creates) the Great Being, the quick *Manas*, which is of an evolved nature, which is far-going, moves in manifold ways, and consists of desire and doubt; then having here overpowered the flaming (being), he created the seven *Mānasas*."

The one account of emanation of Śp 224 thus reflects, as a result of the juxtaposition method of the compiler, two different currents of thought and various stages of development of cosmogonic ideas.

II. The Emanation of the Elements and Senses according to TG II[12]

We will deal here with the 1st Chapter of TG IIA (PP 6ff.) and the 1st Chapter of TG IIB (PP 44ff.). The nucleus of the 1st Chapter of TG II is a cosmogony on Sāṅkhya lines. But it has been enlarged by numerous additions and interpolations; further, in a few cases original verses or lines have been dropped, and there have been a great deal of alterations in the several versions. The texts of the 7 purāṇas which form the basis of TG II, may be divided into 3, and ultimately 2, main groups :

1. Mr 45, 27 ff. (=42, 27ff. in the Veṅkaṭeśvara edition of saṃvat 1967);

2. Vā 4, 5ff., almost identical with Bḍ 1, 3, 1ff. (since the nucleus of both works originally was one purāṇa, cp. Kirfel, PP, Introduction, p. Xff.; but there are many corrupt readings in Bḍ, and a few additions, in Vā); Kū 4, 5ff. and L 70, 2ff. which are both dependent on the ancient nucleus of Vā-Bḍ; Kū, however, has utilized the text of Vi also) ;

3. Pd 5, 2, 82ff. and Vi 1, 2, 1ff. (both are largely identical, but Vi presents some characteristic innovations. In the beginning of the account, and at a few later places, there are lacunae in Pd, so that for some portions we have to depend on Vi alone).

The version of (Pd-)Vi shows clear traces of having been composed on the model of Mr, a dependence which we shall afterwards often have occasion to observe. Ultimately, therefore, there were only two versions: Mr and Vā-Bḍ. Pd-Vi was modelled after Mr, but with such characteristic changes that it must be reckoned as an independent, though secondary, version. At a later time, Kū was composed, and the latest to arise was perhaps the text of L.

12. When both TG IIA and TG IIB are meant, I will henceforward use the symbol TG II.

In giving the numbers of the initial verses of the versions, I have included introductory material (which is reproduced in PP only when it is more or less identical in at least two purāṇas). Now these prefaces display great variety. Though the bulk of the cosmogony is largely identical in all the seven purāṇas, there are six different prefaces: in Vā-Bḍ, Kū, L, Mr, Pd, and Vi. This entails the conclusion that none of the introductions originally belonged to the account of cosmogony. The same result is arrived at when the contents of the cosmogony are compared with those of the introductions. For the cosmogony is, as we shall see, purely mechanistic; the prefaces, on the other hand, are all theistic: Mr and Vā-Bḍ are Brahmāite, Kū and L Śivaite, Pd shows a state of transition from Brahmāism to Viṣṇuism, Vi is as markedly Viṣṇuite as L is Śivaite. We will not discuss the prefaces in detail. The account proper begins with PP 45, 8, left side, or 45, 7c, right side.

Text of PP 45, 8, left side (45, 7c, right side)—46, 10:

Mr:	Vā, Bḍ, Kū, L:
pradhānaṃ kāraṇaṃ yat tad	*avyaktaṃ kāraṇaṃ yat tan*
avyaktâkhyam maharṣayaḥ	*nityaṃ sad-asad-ātmakam* (7)
yad āhuḥ prakṛtiṃ sūkṣmāṃ	*pradhānaṃ prakṛtiṃ câiva*
nityāṃ sad-asad-ātmikām (8)	*yam āhus tattva-cintakāḥ*
dhruvam akṣayyam ajaram	*gandha-varṇa-rasair hīnaṃ*
ameyaṃ nânya-saṃśrayam	*śabda-sparśa-vivarjitam* (8)
gandha-rūpa-rasair hīnaṃ	*ajaraṃ dhruvam akṣayyaṃ*
śabda-sparśa-vivarjitam (9)	*nityaṃ svātmany avasthitam*
	jagad-yoniṃ mahā-bhūtaṃ
	param brahma sanātanam
	vigrahaṃ sarva-bhūtānām
	avyaktam abhavat kila (9)

Mr, Vā, Bḍ, Kū, L:

anādy-antam ajaṃ sūkṣmaṃ triguṇaṃ prabhavâpyayam
(v. l.: *jagad-yoniṃ*, Mr)
asāmpratam avijñeyaṃ brahmâgre samavartata[13] (10).

13. The reading *samāvartata* in Kirfel's text is a misprint.

These verses present a puzzling picture. There are words and lines and ideas identical in both versions, but it is impossible to arrange this material in such a way that one of the versions would be reduced to the other or both derived from a common source, Dilapidation of manuscripts surely cannot account for the divergencies of the texts. For then it would be unexplainable why most of the ideas recur in each of the old versions. The only way out of the impasse is to search in the verses for such material as can be regarded as ancient and to assume that this material was later increased by the redactor of either version.

Now it is in fact possible to find out such ancient material. It consists of three lines. The first of these, which indubitably was the initial line of the whole tract, is the following :

avyaktaṃ kāraṇaṃ yat tan nityaṃ sad-asad-ātmakam.

In Vā, Bḍ, and Kū this line follows immediately after the preface (PP 45, 7 right side). Its two pādas, separated by other words, occur also at Vi 1, 2, 19 and 19d[14] (PP 7, 4_5). It was even inserted into the beginning of TG I (PP 2, 3a—b) by a redactor who wanted to adapt that old cosmogony to views current at his time (cp. my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*), and the cosmogony of the Manusmṛti also contains it, with a slightly different arrangement of the words (M 11 a—b). In Mr, the line is not completely preserved, but the redactor betrays that he knew it by adapting to his new version (with which we will deal below).

Then, after a passage in which the versions diverge, there comes a verse which is largely identical in Mr and Vā-Bḍ :

anādy-antam ajaṃ sūkṣmaṃ triguṇaṃ prabhavâpyayam
(v l. : *jagad-yoniṃ*, Mr)
asāmpratam avijñeyaṃ brahmâgre samavartata (PP 46, 10).

It is evident that this verse has been taken over from the cosmogony of Śp 224, where it is verse 11 (cp. above, p. 305).

14 In Pd, this part of the tract is not preserved, either by deliberate omission or on account of a lacuna in a MS,

However, if we are right in assuming that this verse in the original form of the tract followed immediately after the line *avyaktaṃ kāraṇam...*, we must, in explaining this verse and those preceding it in PP, start from that form which it had originally and which is preserved at Śp 224, 11 :

> *anādy-antam ajaṃ divyam ajaraṃ dhruvam avyayam*
> *apratarkyam avijñeyam brahmâgre sampravartate.*

As for the change of *sampravartate* into *samavartata*, cp. above pp. 306 f. with footnote 4. The change of *apratarkyam* into *asāṃpratam* may be due to the consideration that the former word is to some extent synonymous with *avijñeyam*, whereas *asāṃpratam* ("not of the present time") brings in a new idea.

In the first line, *divyam* was eliminated in all versions, presumably because the redactor did not want to attribute a celestial or supermundane character to the *brahman* which in this context is completely identified with primary matter. But the substitutes for the word are different in the old versions. Vā-Bḍ has replaced it by *sūkṣmam*, an adjective which characterizes the primary matter of the Sāṅkhya system; Mr has deleted both *ajam* and *divyam*, filling their place with *jagadyoniṃ*. However, neither, did Mr dispense with *sūkṣma*, nor would Vā-Bḍ do without *jagadyoni*, Mr relegating *sūkṣma* to PP 45, 8 (left side), where it figures as an attribute of *prakṛti*, and Vā-Bḍ transporting *jagadyoni* to PP 45, 9 (right side) as an apposition to *avyaktaṃ kāraṇam*. So it is probable that the two words were taken by either version from the same source, but inserted into the text of the Sāṅkhya tract in different ways.

The same theory holds good for the change we have to consider next. In the second pāda, *avyaya* was—on grounds I cannot account for—replaced by *akṣayya*, and the three words were in both versions shifted to the preceding verse, but to different places and in different arrangement (Mr : *dhruvam akṣayyam ajaram*; Vā-Bḍ : *ajaraṃ* [v. 1. : *ajātaṃ*] *dhruvam akṣayyam*). The pāda was then filled up by the insertion of the words *triguṇaṃ prabhavâpyayam* in both versions—obviously

with the intention of mentioning Sāṅkhya notions, which had been absent in the Śp cosmogony to which the verse originally belonged. So if the two versions agree in inserting in 46, 10 the words *triguṇaṃ prabhavāpyayam* (which they took from a common source) and in relegating the original words of that pāda to a preceding verse, they differ in the way they have modelled these preceding verses.

These verses in both versions include the idea that *avyakta, pradhāna,* and *prakṛti* are synonymous, though the synonymity is expressed more pronouncedly in Vā-Bḍ than in Mr; besides, they give further characterization of the Unevolved Cause. That the wording of 45, 8 is not original in the form it has in Mr, is also borne out by the fact that, after three feminine adjectives qualifying *prakṛti* in the *yad-āhuḥ* clause, the text continues with neuter adjectives to be construed with *kāraṇam* (45, 8) or with *brahma* (46, 10), which is a somewhat awkward construction and a safe indication of an alteration. Again, the fact that in the sequel (46, 12, left side) *pradhāna* is said to have *originated,* also strongly tells against the assupmtion that the text had originally stated *avyakta, prakṛti,* and *pradhāna* to be so synonymous as Vā-Bḍ asserts them to be. In fact, *avyakta* seems to have been not only the most current term to denote primary matter[15], but perhaps the oldest one too. In the perface of the cosmogonic tract in Vi (PP 7, 4_7), three words of the Mr version of 46, 10 are incorporated, which again shows that Mr was used by Vi.

The two pādas

gandha-rūpa-rasair hīnaṃ śabda-sparśa-vivarjitam

may have belonged to the original tract since they are attested by Mr, (Vā-) Bḍ and, partly, by Vi (PP, 7, 4_6).

Now if we attempt to restore the original wording of the initial verses of the tract, the only possible hypothesis is to assume that in their most ancient form they consisted only of the three lines we have considered above, i. e. PP 45, 7c–d,

15. Cp. E. H. Johnston *Early Sāṃkhya* (London, 1937) p. 26 ff.

right side, and Śp 224, 11, with the addition perhaps of PP 45,9c—d, left side=45,8c—d, right side. If we admit one of the changes introduced into 46, 10 by either Mr or Vā-Bḍ, it will entail the other changes in the preceding verses of either Mr or Vā-Bḍ so that the two versions will fall asunder. Therefore, we have to assume that the compiler of the tract took the verse which is Śp 224, 11 as it was and prefixed to it a line declaring the *brahman* of the following verse to be the Unevolved Cause. Subsequently, the redactor of Mr introduced some changes and additions. In the first verse, he did not entirely identify the three terms *avyakta, pradhāna* and *prakṛti*, but retained *avyakta* as the main term, only adding that it was the "Main Cause" (*pradhānam kāraṇam*) and that the Great Ṛṣis called it "Subtle Primary Matter" (*prakṛtiṃ sūkṣmām*). After this, Vā-Bḍ was redacted. Its redactor knew the ancient tract and Mr. He thought it fit to restore the initial line to its original form, to which he added two pādas which completely identify the three terms (PP 45, 8a—b, right side). This change then entailed others. *sūkṣma* could no longer get a place as an attribute of *prakṛti*; so the redactor placed it in 46, 10, restoring at the same time the ancient *ajam*, but relegating *jagadyonim* to the preceding verse. Why he replaced the pāda *ameyaṃ nânyasaṃśrayam* by *nityaṃ svâtmany avasthitam* and changed the place of the half verse *gandharūparasair hīnaṃ śabdasparśavivarjitam*, is not clear. He changed the arrangement of the words *dhruvam akṣayyam ajaram* to render the metre more correct. At the end of 9, he anticipated the description of the *avyakta* as *brahman* because he wanted to take *brahmâgre* in 46, 10 as *Brahmā agre* (cp. below, p. 324). He added the description of the *brahman* as a Great Being and as the Body of all beings (9c, e). So the wording of Vā-Bḍ can be explained on the assumption that the redactor of this version utilized the ancient tract as well as the version of Mr. On the other hand, it is not conceivable that, conversely, Mr should have been redacted under the influence of Vā-Bḍ. It is, e. g., highly improbable that the redactor of Mr, in altering the four initial pādas of Vā-Bḍ, should have taken *sūkṣma* from 46, 10 and at the same time shifted *jagadyoni* from

45, 9 to 46, 10; and it is quite impossible that he should have omitted the mention of *brahma* in 46, 9d (right side) if he also, as the redactor of Vā-Bḍ did, had taken *brahmâgre* in 46, 10 as *Brahmā agre*.

So the result of our investigation is that Mr is anterior to Vā-Bḍ. This is corroborated by a scrutiny of the subsequent verses.

The possibility, which has also to be considered, that 46, 10 might have been added to the text later (with a view to adapting it to the earlier tract of Śp 224) can safely be denied. For there are more facts than one to indicate that the verse formed an integral part of the tract *ab initio*:

(a) Parts of the cosmogonic account of Śp 224 occur elsewhere in the 1st chapter of TG II also, and it is impossible to omit them without removing essential parts of the cosmogony; so the author must have deliberately shaped his cosmogony on the model of the account which is preserved in Śp 224;

(b) The verse is attested by all the three versions, Mr and Vā-Bḍ quoting it in full, and Vi using parts of it;

(c) The ancient pāda *ajaraṃ dhruvam akṣayyam* (for *avyayam*), though removed from its original place, is also attested by all the three versions;

(d) Parts of the new material of both Mr and Vā-Bḍ are inserted in the verse differently in both versions.

To summarize the contents, we may state:

The Unevolved Cause [which is also called *prakṛti* and *pradhāna*], which is everlasting (*nitya*) and neither being nor non-being; which is devoid of smell, colour, taste, sound, and tangibility (i. e. not perceptible by any of the senses); which is ageless, stable, and imperishable; [which is unknowable and not dependent on anything else (Mr, Vi)—or: which constantly rests in its own self (Vā-Bḍ)]; which is the origin of the world [which is a Great Being, the eternal, highest *Brahman*, and the body of all that has become (Vā-Bḍ)]—is the *Brahman* without

beginning or end, unborn, subtle, consisting of the three Qualities, the origin and the (place of) reabsorption (of all things), not of the present time, incognizable: (this *Brahman*) existed in the beginning.

It is of importance to note that the text of this tract retains the description of the primeval state as *brahman*. Whether this term was original in the genuine Sāṅkhya or grafted upon the system secondarily by harmonizers, is a question which cannot be decided on the basis of the texts dealt with in this article. Anyhow, the data of the two texts, Śp 224 and TG II, in combination with the history of the Vedānta, suggest the interpretation that there was a bifurcation of the *brahman* monism of the early upaniṣads: one line leading to to the spiritualistic monism of later Vedānta philosophy, which was preformed in the early texts, and a second one, also foreshadowed in some early upaniṣad texts, leading eventually to the identification of *brahman* with primary matter in PP 45, 8 (7)—46, 10. The existence of the latter view is also attested by Gauḍapāda, who mentions *brahman* as a synonym of *prakṛti*, *pradhāna* and *avyakta* in his commentary on Sāṅkhyakārikā 22.

Text of PP 46, 11—12:

Mr (45, 35—36):	Vā (4, 22c—24):
pralayasyânu tenêdaṃ	*tasyâtmanā sarvam idam*
vyāptam āsīd aśeṣataḥ |	*vyāptam āsīt tamomayam* |
guṇa-sāmyāt tatas tasmāt	*guṇa-sāmye tadā tasmin*
	guṇa-bhāve tamomaye |
	sarga-kāle pradhānasya
kṣetrajñâdhiṣṭhitān mune (11)	*kṣetrajñâdhiṣṭhitasya vai* (11)
guṇa-bhāvāt sṛjyamānāt	*guṇa-bhāvād vācyamāno*
sarga-kāle tataḥ punaḥ |	*mahān prādurbabhūva ha* |
pradhānaṃ tattvam udbhūtaṃ	*sūkṣmeṇa mahatā so 'tha*
mahāntaṃ tat samāvṛṇot (12)	*avyaktena samāvṛtaḥ* (12)

Parallels of Vi:

Vi 1, 2, 21c—d (PP 7, 4_7c—d):
tenâgre sarvam evâsīd vyāptaṃ vai pralayād anu

Vi 1, 2, 33—34b (PP 8,6—7b):
guṇa-sāmyāt tatas tasmāt kṣetrajñâdhiṣṭhitān mune
....
pradhāna-tattvam udbhūtaṃ mahāntaṃ tat samāvṛṇot.

The readings of Vā may represent those of the Vā-Bḍ nucleus. They produce the impression of an attempt, though not a very skilful one, to reinterpret some statements of Mr which the redactor found puzzling. He understood all the words of 46, 10, up to *avijñeyam*, as qualifying the *avyaktam* (45, 9f., right side), but took *brahmâgre* as *Brahmā agre*, i. e. he found here a reference to the personal Creator, probably because the masculine *Brahmā* is signified at another place of the same text (PP 51, 58) by the same words in an unmistakable context (*ādikartā ca bhūtānāṃ Brahmâgre samavartata*), even in Mr. Therefore, in order to maintain the identification of the *avyakta* with the *brahman*, he inserted a mention of the neuter *brahman* in the preceding verse (*paraṃ brahma sanātanam* 45, 9d, right side). In 46, 11a also, he deemed a change necessary. The demonstrative pronoun of this pāda can only refer to the word *brahma* or *Brahmā* of the preceding pāda. The redactor, who thought that *Brahmā* was meant there, saw the idea of the *Puruṣasūkta* and of such passages as PP 5, 25c—d of TG I (*divaṃ ca pṛthivīṃ câiva mahimnā vyāpya tiṣṭhati*) expressed in the *vyāptam* of 46, 11; but it seemed to him too indistinct an expression to say that the universe was pervaded "by him". So he changed the *tena* of Mr into *tasyâtmanā*—i.e., "by his self" the universe was pervaded—, an expression which unmistakably refers to a person. So here again Vā-Bḍ is clearly secondary as compared with Mr.

In the next pāḍas, there is a slight unevenness in the text of Mr. For not only is the state of equipoise of the *guṇas* expressed in two different words, *guṇasāmyāt* and *guṇabhāvāt*, but, the sense of "then" is also expressed twice, by *tataḥ* in 11c and *tataḥ punaḥ* in 12b. It is hard to conceive that this is original. I think that the half-verse *guṇasāmyāt tatas tasmāt kṣetrajñâdhiṣṭhitān mune* is an interpolation and that it was the redactor of

Mr who inserted it into the old Sāṅkhya tract. The purpose of the insertion was, firstly, to explain the somewhat obscure *guṇabhāvāt* of 12a—which was altogether dropped by Vi—by the unambiguous *guṇasāmyāt*. Secondly, the interpolator thought it fit also to mention the personal Creator's activity at the beginning of the creation (the redactor of Vā-Bḍ had found a reference to the Creator in 10·1 as we have seen); so he added *kṣetrajñādhiṣṭhitāt*.[15a] But if the original account had made any mention of the Creator, it would be rather surprising that it should have done so only in one member of a compound word, after the lengthy description that was given of the primeval state of the world. Hindu cosmogonic tracts that are originally theistic start by more or less elaborate characterizations of the Creator and sometimes even with words of adoration addressed to him. Moreover, all the seven purāṇas which have incorporated the Sāṅkhyic account of cosmogony follow this practice, but, as we have seen, these prefaces were added by the redactors of the several purāṇas and none of them formed part of the Sāṅkhya tract. Therefore, the brief mention of the *kṣetrajña* makes the pāda in which it occurs suspicious, and the following vocative (*mune*) only adds to the suspicion, though the compiler of Vi thought it fit to retain it. For it is hardly conceivable that there was any vocative in the original Sāṅkhya tract.

In 11c—12b, the twisted syntax of the verses of Vā-Bḍ is a clear indication of the secondary origin of this version. It is of importance to note that in Vā-Bḍ the *Mahān* is the first product of the emanation process, whereas in Mr.—and, after it, in Vi—the *pradhānaṃ tattvam* arises first. Vā-Bḍ has combined *pradhāna* with *sargakāle* in a genitive which most probably is meant to say, not that the *pradhāna* was emitted from the *brahman* or *avyakta* (genitivus objectivus), but that it emitted the products of creation (genitivus subjectivus), *avyakta* and *pradhāna* were absolutely synonymous to the redactor of Vā-Bḍ, but not to the author of the ancient tract as becomes clear from Mr 45, 36

15a. *kṣetrajña* is here to be understood as a synonym of *Brahmā*; cp. PP. 51, 57 : *kṣetrajño Brahma-saṃjñitaḥ* (Mr, Vā-Bḍ, Kū, L).

(PP. 46, 12, left side), where it is said that from the State of *Guṇas* (of the Unevolved Cause) the Main Principle (*pradhānam tattvam*) *arose*. Vi has retained this old view, and a number of variant readings in the whole tract also indicate that *avyaktam* (*kāraṇam*) and *pradhānam* (*tattvam*) were not originally synonymous, though identified later. Nor was *prakṛti* originally a synonym of *avyakta* and *pradhāna*; as 53, 64d shows, the old tract knew of eight *prakṛtis*, but nowhere, except in the initial verse, which is a product of later remodelling, was one *prakṛti* mentioned. I think it is important to bear in mind the difference that was observed by the ancient Sāṅkhya tract in the use of the three terms.

According to Mr, the text of which may here represent that of the original Short Tract, "at the time of emanation the Main Principle arose from the State of *Guṇas*, while this was being sent forth", i. e. while the Three Qualities were losing their undifferentiated state of equipoise and becoming manifest as characterizers of things. In Mr, as in Pd-Vi, the *mahān* is not expressly stated to have become manifest. The text mentions it only as having been covered or enveloped by the Main Principle, and this envelopment is further described in the following verse (PP 46, 13; see below). In the sequel of the account, each following *tanmātra* element is stated to have been "enveloped" by, after it had been manifested by emanation from, the *tanmātra* preceding it in the series.

Mr (45, 37):	Vi (1, 2, 34c—f) / Pd (5, 88c—89 b):
yathā bījaṃ tvacā tadvad	*sāttviko rājasaś caiva*
avyaktenâvṛto mahān	*tāmasaś ca tridhā mahān*
sāttviko rājasaś caiva	*pradhāna-tattvena samaṃ*
tāmasaś ca tridhôditaḥ	*tvacā bījam ivâvṛtam.*

(The corresponding text of Vā-Bḍ is negligible).

In this case, I would give preference to the text of Pd-Vi, firstly because it has the advantage of being the *lectio difficilior*, secondly because it retains the word *pradhānatattva*, not replacing

it by *avyakta* (which was not originally synonymous with *pradhānatattva*).

Translation of PP 8, 7c—f :

"The *Mahān* is threefold : consisting of goodness, passion, and darkness. As a seed is enveloped by its rind, in the same way (the *Mahān* is enveloped) by the Main Principle".

After the mention of the *Mahān*, Vā-Bḍ has a long interpolation (46, 14—48, 30) in which the Great One is deified and identified with *Brahmā* and many other entities. We will pass over that passage.

Text of PP 48, 31—49, 38/ 8,—9, 15 :

For the following verses, a fairly good text can be constituted on the basis of Mr and Pd-Vi, with utilization of Vā (-Bḍ) at some passages. After each line, I note the purāṇas on which my text is mainly based.

tatas tasmād ahaṃkāras trividho vai vyajāyata (Mr)
vaikārikas taijasaś ca bhūtâdiś ca sa tāmasaḥ (Mr)
yathā pradhānena[1]) *mahān mahatā sa tathâvṛtaḥ* (Vi)
bhūtâdis tu vikurvāṇaḥ śabda-tanmātrakam tataḥ (Mr, Vi)
sasarja śabda-tanmātrād ākāśam śabda-lakṣaṇam (Mr, Vi)
ākāśaṃ śabda-mātraṃ tu bhūtâdiś câvṛṇot tataḥ (Mr)
ākāśas tu vikurvāṇaḥ sparśa-mātraṃ sasarja ha[2]) (Vā, Pd-Vi)
balavāñ jāyate vāyus tasya sparśo guṇo mataḥ[3]) (Mr)
ākāśaṃ śabda-mātraṃ tu sparśa-mātraṃ samāvṛṇot[4]) (Vā, Vi)
vāyuś câpi vikurvāṇo rūpa-mātraṃ sasarja ha (Mr, Vā);
jyotir utpadyate vāyos tad rūpa-guṇam ucyate[5]) (Mr, Vā, Vi)
sparśa-mātraṃ[6]) *tu vai vāyū rūpa-mātraṃ samāvṛṇot* (Vi)
jyotiś câpi vikurvāṇaṃ rasa-mātraṃ sasarja ha (Mr, Pd-Vi)
sambhavanti tato hy āpaś câsan vai tā rasâtmikāḥ[7]) (Mr)
rasa-mātraṃ tu tā hy āpo[8]) *rūpa-mātraṃ samāvṛṇot* (Mr)
āpaś câpi vikurvatyo[9]) *gandha mātraṃ sasarjire* (Mr)
saṃghāto jāyate tasmāt tasya gandho guṇo mataḥ (Mr, Vi).

Notes :

1) The text of Mr has here again *avyaktena* instead of *pradhānena*, but after what preceded I think that only *pradhānena*

is possible if we want to restore the original terminology of the tract. The redactor of Vi must have taken the word from the original independent tract. Cp. note 4.

[2]) In this line, Mr is not original; possibly the MS used by the redactor of Mr had been corrupt here. The *nâtra saṃśayaḥ* of Mr is a clear sign of the secondary origin of the line.

[3]) This line is identical with Śp 224, 36c—d.

[4]) This line is lacking in Mr and in Pd. Vi has restored it; so the redactor of that version must have utilized more than one MS or version: not only Pd and Mr, but probably Vā(-Bḍ) also, if he did not take the line from the original independent tract.

[5]) The last pāda is identical with Śp 224, 37d.

[6]) Mr: *sparśa-mātras tu vai vāyū*; Vā: *sparśa-mātraṃ tu vai vāyo*; Vi (1, 2, 41c Gorakhpur ed.; 1, 2, 39g Calcutta ed. of 1882): *sparśamātraṃ tu vai vāyū*. The latter reading (*lectio difficilior*) seems to be the original one, which was replaced in Mr and Vā by constructions that are grammatically clearer but have no parallels in the rest of the tract. *vāyuḥ* (*vāyū*) is an apposition to *sparśa-mātram*. All the *mātra*-compounds of the tract are nouns, not adjectives.

[7]) *rasātmikāḥ* also at Śp 224, 38 b.

[8]) It is not necessary to see in *āpo* a grammatical mistake (a nominative employed as an accusative) as Pargiter (in his translation of Mr, Calcutta, 1904, Bibl. Ind.) and Kirfel (who puts the mark [!] after *āpo*) had done. If we adopt the reading of Mr, *rasamātram* (instead of *-āḥ*), *tā hy āpo* may be construed as a short independent sentence: "for this is water". Pd-Vi has removed the difficulty by substituting *aṃbhāṃsi* for *āpaḥ*.

[9]) The *parasmaipada* participle is surprising. May we replace it by *vikurvāṇā* on the authority of Pd-Vi (which have *vikurvāṇāni, cāmbhāṃsi*, PP 9, 15) and Kū (which has *āpaś*

cāpi vikurvāṇā, but is perhaps the latest of the extant versions of the tract) ?

Translation :

From this (*Mahān*) then arose the threefold Egoity: that one which is Subject to Modifications, the Glowing (or : Passionate)One, and the Origin of the Elements which consists of darkness. It was enveloped by the *Mahān* as the *Mahān* was by the Main (Principle). Then the Origin of the Elements, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Sound, and from this the Ether, which is characterized by sound, (arose). The Origin of the Elements, however, then enveloped the ether, (which had the form of) the subtle matter of sound. The ether, while differentiating itself, produced the Subtle Matter of Palpability, (thus) the strong Wind is born; palpability is known to be its property. But the ether, (which had the form of the) subtle matter of sound, enveloped the subtle matter of palpability. Then the wind, while differentiating itself, produced the Subtle Matter of Visibility. Light arises from the wind; its property is called visibility. The wind, however, (which had the form of the) subtle matter of palpability, enveloped the subtle matter of visibility. Light, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Taste. From that, Water arises; its essence is taste. The subtle matter of visibility enveloped the subtle matter of taste, which is water. Water, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Smell. From that, the Aggregate is born ; smell is known to be its property."

After this account of elemental emanation, Vā has the line *rasamātraṃ tu tat toyaṃ gandha-mātraṃ samāvṛṇot* (PP 49, 39). But this line occurs in none of the other versions, not even in L, which is throughout dependent on Vā. We have therefore to assume that the original tract did not mention the "envelopment" of the subtle matter of smell by that of taste and that the line was interpolated in Vā after the redaction of L.—As the last product of the emanation process one would expect to find earth. Instead, the text has *saṃghāta*, "the Aggregate". This term suggests the view of the *accumulation theory* that earth includes subtle particles of all the elements preceding it in the series of

emanation. But it is not this idea which is brought out by the mention of "envelopment". For the accumulation theory does not, as the *envelopment* theory does, teach the reabsorption of a following *tanmātra* by the preceding one but, conversely, the admixture of particles of all preceding elements to each item of the emanation series.

A comparison with Śp 224.

Here it becomes evident that the whole tract on cosmogonic emanation has been composed on the pattern of the cosmogony of Śp 224. In fact, it is nothing but a *remodelling of the old account* with the inclusion of the more developed views of a later time. The *Manas*, which "differentiates from itself the creation" (*sṛṣṭiṃ vikurute*), has been dropped, but the *Mahān* is here intermediate between the Main Principle and the *Ahaṃkāra*; in the process of emanation *Tanmātras* are interposed between each preceding and each following element; there is the idea that, after a gross element had evolved from its Subtle Particles, these are "enveloped" by the element preceding in the series; and there is, at the beginning of the tract, the idea of the subtle, imperceptible Primary matter, consisting of Three Qualities. All this corresponds to a form of the Sāṅkhya system, though not of that of the Kārikā.

Much material of the ancient tract of Śp 224 has been incorporated into the later one. Not only has the old introductory verse (Śp 224, 11) been preserved, with some modifications, but the terms *vikurvāṇa* has been retained, and even the word *guṇa*, though in the same tract occurring in the later sense of "Quality of the Unevolved Cause", has at the same time been used in the old technical sense of "Property of an Element" (later Śp texts[16] replaced it by *viśeṣa* in this sense). Further, one line, one pāda and one expression have been preserved. And, though the whole account was conceived in past tenses, the present tense *jāyate* of the line taken from Śp

16 E. g. Śp (CE) 298, 14 and 299, 11 = Bombay ed. (Poona reprint of 1932) 310, 14 and 311, 12.

224, 36 drew after it even a few further cases of use of the present tense ((*utpadyate, sambhavanti, jāyate*).

Frauwallner observes in his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (vol. 1, p. 303) that the evolution theory of the Sāṅkhya was probably shaped on the model of the *Śukânupraśna* cosmogony (i. e., Śp 224). This statement is now corroborated by textual history. Nay, the purāṇas even contain an ancient tract—earlier than the 4th century A.D.[17]—which describes the whole process of cosmogony on the lines of a form of the Sāṅkhya system. I am convinced that this text is another instance of a Short Instructional Tract, which had once existed independently, but was then incorporated into works of the anonymous literature and has thus come down to us.

Text of PP 49, 39—50, 45b (cp. 9, 15_1—18) :

[*tasmiṃs tasmiṃs tu tan-mātraṃ tena tanmātratā smṛtā*
(v. l.: *tan-mātrā* Vā, Vi)
aviśeṣa-vācakatvād aviśeṣās tataś ca te (39)
na śāntā nâpi ghorās te na mūḍhāś câviśeṣaṇāḥ
bhūta-tanmātra-sargo 'yam ahaṃkārāt tu tāmasāt (40)
vaikārikāt ahaṃkārāt sattvôdriktāt tu sāttvikāt
vaikārikaḥ sa sargas tu yugapat sampravartate (41)
buddhîndriyāṇi pañcâiva pañca karmêndriyāṇi ca[1])]
taijasānîndriyāṇy āhur devā vaikārikā daśa (42)
[*ekādaśaṃ manas tatra devā vaikārikāḥ smṛtāḥ*[2])]
śrotraṃ tvak cakṣuṣī jihvā nāsikā câiva pañcamī[3]) (43)
śabdâdīnām avāpty-arthaṃ buddhi-yuktāni cakṣate[4])
pādau pāyur upasthaś ca hastau vāk pañcamī bhavet (44)
gatir visargo hy ānandaḥ śilpaṃ vākyaṃ ca karma tat (45a—b)

This text has throughout been given according to Mr.

NOTES :

[1]) 39—42b are missing in Pd. As there are a number of

17. The cosmogony of TG II belongs to nucleus of Vā-Bḍ, which was redacted shortly after 335 A. D. (cp. PP, Introduction, p. XVIII f., and my monograph *Prahlāda* [Mainz, 1959] p. 24; consequently it must be considerably older.

apparent lacunae in the cosmogonic account of that purāṇa, the absence of the seven lines is not by itself an indication of their being unoriginal. But there are some features of the contents of these lines which are apt to rouse doubts as to their having belonged to the original form of the independent Short Tract.

(1) The preceding account had not only, as 40c—d states, described the emanation of the *tanmātras* but had mentioned the origination of the *gross* elements also. Therefore, neither is 40c—d exact nor does the form of the preceding account, which does not specially treat of *tanmātras*, suggest a necessity for an explanation of this term at this place. On the other hand, 39c—40b are so similar to Sāṅkhyakārikā 38 (*tanmātrāṇy aviśeṣās tebhyo bhūtāni pañca pañcabhyaḥ | ete smṛtā-viśeṣāḥ śāntā ghorāś ca mūḍhāś ca*) that the idea suggests itself that they were composed and inserted to adapt the doctrine of the tract to that of the Kārikā.

(2) The same idea is suggested by 40c—42b, which remind of the Kārikās 24—25. According to these two Kārikās there are two sorts of emanation: the *tanmātraḥ sargaḥ*, which is *tāmasa*, and the *ekādaśakaḥ sargaḥ* of the senses, which is *sāttvika* and proceeds from the *vaikārika* or *vaikṛta* form of the *ahaṃkāra*, and it is this idea which is expressed in 40c—42b. However, to reproduce the contents of Kārikā 25 completely, it would have been necessary also to state that the *taijasa* form of the *ahaṃkāra* was operative in both the *tāmasa* and *sāttvika* (or *vaikārika*) emanations. This would have created a glaring contradiction to 42c, which reserves the attribute *taijasa* to the senses. But while this was avoided, an inconsistency arose all the same, for in 42c—d the senses were called *taijasa*, whereas in the (interpolated) lines 41—42b they were derived from the *vaikārika* form of the *ahaṃkāra*, (42c—d will be discussed in the following note).

Vi has 39 and 40 (with a few variants) but omits 41—42a. Perhaps the redactor of Vi felt that 41—42a, besides being absent in the old independent tract, were not in harmony with 42c—d; so he omitted these lines though he took 39—40 from Mr.

Apparently the intention of harmonizing the tract with the doctrine of a text (the Sāṅkhyakārikā) which (in the meantime ?) had become recognized as authoritative, could not fully succeed, since it was combined with the traditionalist tendency of preserving the old text. There is one line (40c—d) which is not in harmony with the *preceding* account and there are others (41 a—42 b which are not in keeping with the *following* (42c—d). As for the rest, there are two lines (39c—40b) which, though not inconsistent with the context, have also evidently been composed under the influence of the Kārikā, whereas the line 39 a—b produces the impression of having been added by a redactor who found that a definition of the term *tanmātra* was necessary as an introduction to 39c—40d ; it is improbable that the original tract, which left unexplained other obscure terms (e. g. *vaikārika*), should have given a definition of *tanmātra* at the end of what was not an account of *bhūta-tanmātra-sarga* but a description of the emanation of the (gross) elements with each *tanmātra* emanating from the gross element preceding it in the series and each *tanmātra* immediately producing the corresponding gross element.

Therefore it is probable that the original Short Tract did not contain the lines 39a—42b and that Pd, in omitting them, has preserved a feature of the original tract.

[1]) 42c—d must be regarded as original. For while the statement of 41—42b that the senses are a product of the *vaikārika-sarga* is easily traceable to the influence of another text, the description of the senses as *taijasa* seems to be peculiar to the Short Tract of Emanation. It must therefore be assumed that the original Tract, after describing the emanation from

"the *bhūtādi*, which is *tāmasa*", continued by stating : "The senses are called *taijasa*", thus suggesting only implicitly that they proceeded from the *taijasa* form of the *ahaṃkāra*. A similar implicit statement we met with at the beginning of the account where the origination of the *mahān* was not expressly stated (cp. above).

42d presents a problem. Two interpretations are possible : the deities mentioned here are either *identical* with the senses or they *preside* over them. The first alternative was adopted by Pargiter in his translation of Mr (Bibl. Ind.), and it may be supported by passages like Śp (CE) 203, 31 (Bombay ed : 210, 33) ; the second possibility would be in keeping with the view of Brahmasūtra 2, 4, 14—16. It seems to me that the second possibility is the more probable one. For if the gods were identical with the senses, these would be *taijasa* and *vaikārika* at the same time according to 42c—d. It would however be more logical if the *tāmasa, vaikārika* and *taijasa* forms of the *ahaṃkāra* each had its own function or products, and it is well understandable that the *vaikārika,* in which *sattva* is predominant, should produce the *gods* presiding over the senses while the senses themselves emanated from the *taijasa.* I would therefore suggest to take 42d to mean : "The ten gods (who control the senses) are *vaikārika.*" The redactor, however, who interpolated 41a—42b, certainly did not understand 42d in this sense.

The fact that the *devā vaikārikāḥ* are once more mentioned in 43a—b rouses suspicion as to the originality of this line. Moreover, the line breaks the connexion of 42c—d, which mentions the (ten) senses and the ten deities presiding over them, with 43c—45b, which name these senses and their functions. I think, therefore, that the line has to be rejected and that the original Tract did not mention the *manas* at all—possibly because the *manas* was understood to be included in the *mahān*, which had taken its place in the emanation series. The insertion of a mention of the common

idea of the *manas* as the eleventh sense is easily explainable from that harmonizing tendency which, along with the other tendency of preserving what had been handed down, is one of the forces that dominated the development of texts of the anonymous literature.

The mention of the *manas* was expanded to a full line by a repetition of the statement that the senses were *devā vaikārikāḥ* (43b). 43a—b might perhaps be understood to mean that the mind *is* the (ten) *vaikārika gods*. The grammatical difficulty involved in this interpretation might be tolerable in a purāṇic text. The resumption of the words *devā vaikārikāḥ* would thus not be a mere repetition but serve a special purpose. The doctrine would be similar to that of Sāṅkhyasūtra 2, 17—19 (cp. Aniruddha's commentary: *āntaraṃ manaḥ iti ekādaśakam indriyam*; Garbe [*Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, 2nd ed., pp. 299f.] erroneously states this to be general Sāṅkhya teaching). But the view of the *manas* as the special outcome of the *vaikārika-sarga* seems to have arisen at a very late date, whereas the interpolation of 43a—b belongs to an early time since the line occurs in Mr, Pd, and Vi (Vā has remodelled it, and L, here as elsewhere, has followed Vā). Therefore it is not very probable that the interpolator should have intended to express that view.

[3]) In 42 and 43, Pd and Vi have a number of unimportant variants.

[4]) *cakṣate* is a conjecture, first proposed by Pargiter in his translation of Mr. The text has *vakṣyate*, which does not make sense. The emendations of L, Pd and Vi are negligible.

Translation:

"[In each of them there is only that (Vā, Vi: In each of them there is a particle [*mātrā*] of it); this is why tradition speaks (of them) as being *Tanmātras*. And hence they are without differences, for (the word *tanmātra*) is not expressive of difference. They are neither calm, nor terrible, nor dull, being without differences. This emanation of the *tanmātras* of the elements

(proceeds) from the *ahaṃkāra* characterized by darkness. From the *ahaṃkāra* subject to modifications, however which is of the nature of goodness (and) possesses goodness in excess, the *vaikārika* emanation begins at the same time: the five knowledge-senses and the five action-senses]. The senses are called glowing (i. e., luminous and vigorous); the ten deities are *vaikārika*. [The mind is among them the eleventh. They are traditionally called the *vaikārika* deities.] The ear, the skin, the eyes, the tongue, and the nose as the fifth are called (organs) connected with knowledge for perceiving sounds and other (sense-objects). The feet, the anus, the organ of generation, the hands, (among which) the voice is the fifth; walking, evacuation, (sexual) delight, manual work, and speech: that is the work (for each of the action-senses)"[18]

III. Results

(of this study, combined with some results of my paper *Two Accounts of Cosmogony* and my monograph *Prahlāda*)

1. For the history of texts of the anonymous literature:

(a) The oldest version of those parts of the purāṇas which deal with cosmogony on Sāṅkhya lines, is that of Mr. The other original parts of Mr[19] were evidently redacted at the same time, and this redaction preceded that of the Vā-Bḍ nucleus. The investigation of the cosmogony of Mr leads to the same result at which F. E. Pargiter arrived from quite different considerations[20], viz. the nucleus of Mr was compiled about 300 A. D. The redaction of Vā-Bḍ is plainly later, and it took place shortly after 335 A. D.[21]. After the nucleus of Vā-Bḍ, the cosmogony of Pd was redacted; then, perhaps about 500 A. D., Vi[22]; then,

18. The rest of the account of cosmogony of TG II I will leave over for later studies.

19. Cp. F. E. Pargiter's translation of Mr (Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1904), Introduction, pp. iv—vii.

20. Cp. op. cit., Introduction, pp. xix—xx.

21. Cp. PP, Introduction, p. xix, and my *Prahlāda*, pp. 23 f.

22. Cp. my *Prahlāda* pp. 24 and 147 f.

perhaps in the 7th or 8th century, Kū[23]. L is later than Vā-Bḍ, but its chronology in relation to Pd, Vi and Kū cannot yet be determined. Likewise, the question of the time when the single redactions of Vā and Bḍ arose is still unsettled.

(b) Some tracts incorporated in Śp are considerably older than the third century A. D., probably dating from pre-Christian times.

(c) The first adhyāya of the Manusmṛti was composed later than the independent tracts that were incorporated into Śp 224, but earlier than, or approximately at the same time as, the final redaction of Śp 224, presumably in the first centuries A. D.

(d) There are Short Instructional Tracts, which once had an independent existence and were preserved because they were incorporated into the anonymous literature. There are certain laws governing their textual development (modernizations, harmonizations of different traditions, adaptations to the context, juxtaposition of different beginnings).

2. For the history of philosophy :

(a) There was an Instructional Tract, composed in the third century A. D. at the latest, which expounded the evolution of the world according to a form of the Sāṅkhya system and is largely preserved in different versions in seven purāṇas.

The Sāṅkhya of the original form of this tract, which can be reconstructed with some amount of probability, is to some extent identical with that of the Sāṇkhyakārikā but deviates from it in some points : (A) *avyakta*, the unevolved cause or primary matter, is distinguished from *pradhāna(tattva)*, which is the first product of its evolution ; (B) there is no special *tanmātra-sarga*, but the emanation of the *tanmātras* is combined with that of the gross elements, each following *tanmātra* emanating from the gross element preceding it in the series ; (C) after a gross

23. Cp. my *Prahlāda*, pp, 193 f. The investigation of the history of the legend of Prahlāda, led to the same results for the relative chronology of Vā-Bḍ, Vi and Kū as the study of the cosmogonical texts of these purāṇas.

element has originated, the *tanmātra* that was its source is "enveloped" (*ā-vr, sam-ā-vr*) by the *tanmātra* preceding it in the series; (D) the ten senses are products of *taijasa* emanation, whereas the results of *vaikārika* emanation seem to be the deities presiding over the senses; (E) the *manas* does not seem to have been mentioned in the oldest form of the tract.—Later harmonization or modernization has attempted to blur some of these deviations (A, D) and to introduce some ideas from the *Kārikā* (B, E). *In view of the fact, detectable by textual criticism*, that the old Short Tract was later on interpolated under the influence of the Sāṅkhyakārikā, in combination with the dates suggested above, the hypothesis may be ventured that the Sāṅkhyakārikā was regarded as an authoritative text as early as 300 A. D. The old Short Tract, however, was composed at a time when the Kārikā either was not yet in existence or had not yet received general recognition.

(b) This Sāṅkhya tract has been modelled on the pattern of an earlier exposition of the evolution of the world which is preserved in Śp 224. This latter text, which is pre-Sāṅkhyic, probably dates from pre-Christian times.

3. For the history of religion :

(a) There are clear traces of a constant antagonism between theism and impersonalism in the anonymous literature from pre-Christian times to about the 4th or 5th century A. D.

(b) The data of the anonymous literature point to the existence, in the first centuries B. C. and the first centuries A. D., of an influential Hindu sect that adored *Brahmā* as the highest deity.

(c) About the 4th or 5th century A.D. the glory of *Brāhmā* faded away and *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva* took his place, some texts substituting the one, some the other god for *Brahmā*.

(d) From that time, the old opposition between theism and impersonalism was largely replaced by the new antagonism between Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism.

मुद्गलपुराणविषयसमालोचनम्

पं० गिरिधरशर्म्मा चतुर्वेदी

[The Mudgala-Purāṇa is counted among the eighteen Aupa-Purāṇas. It is still unpublished, and is available in manuscripts only. The present article is based on the two manuscripts of the Mudgala-Purāṇa, deposited in the Kāśirāja-Sarasvatī-Bhaṇḍāra of Ramnagar. It is the summary of a discourse given by the learned author according to the Purāṇa-pravacana-scheme of H. H. the Kāśinareśa (for which see 'Purāṇa' Vol. III, pp. 401 f.).

The Mudgala-Purāṇa mainly deals with God *Gaṇapati*, his worship and his glorification. He is conceived here as the supreme brahman, all other gods being considered as subordinate to him. *Buddhi* and *Siddhi* are said to be the two forms of his *Māyā*. This Purāṇa presents various conceptions of *Gaṇapati*. In one place he is conceived as the universe-qualified *brahman*—his head being the *brahman*, and his remaining body the universe. In another place he is conceived as *yoga*, the head being the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* and the body the *sa-vikalpa-samādhi*. Each of the several khaṇḍas of the Mudgala Purāṇa explains a particular name of God *Gaṇapati*. The superiority of Gaṇeśa over the other principal gods—Sūrya, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra-Śiva and Kārtikeya—has been established by means of various episodes or ākhyānas. The symbolism underlying the conception of his protruding belly and the four hands—holding *pāśa*, *aṅkuśa*, *modaka* and *kamala*, his elephant-face, and his *vāhana*, mouse, is also explained here. Besides, the stories of the birth of Moha and Kārtikeya from the seed of Rudra-Śiva are also narrated, and the

genealogies of the Solar and Lunar dynasties given, where-in Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Yudhiṣṭhira and others are also said to have worshipped *Gaṇapati.*]

मुद्गलपुराणमुपपुराणेषु क्वचिद् गणितम्। क्वचित्तु उपपुराणेभ्योऽप्यवरकक्षाकेष्वौपपुराणेषु गण्यते। औपपुराणानि चातिपुरा नाम्नापि केचिदाहुः। एषां नामानि च बृहद्विवेके स्मर्यन्ते—

आद्यं सनत्कुमारं च नारदीयं बृहच्च यत्।
आदित्यं मानवं प्रोक्तं नन्दिकेश्वरमेव च॥
कौर्मं भागवतं ज्ञेयं वाशिष्टं भार्गवं तथा।
मुद्गलं कल्कि-देव्यौ च महाभागवतं तथा॥
बृहद्धर्म्मं परानन्दं वह्निं पशुपतिं तथा।
हरिवंशं ततो ज्ञेयमिदमौपपुराणकम्॥

अत्र पठितानि सनत्कुमारादीनि कानिचिदुपपुराणेष्वपि पठ्यन्ते—

आद्यं सनत्कुमारोक्तं नारसिंहमथापरम्।
तृतीयं स्कान्दमुद्दिष्टं कुमारेण तु भाषितम्॥
चतुर्थं शिवधर्माख्यं साक्षान्नन्दीशभाषितम्।
दुर्वाससोक्तमाश्चर्यं नारदोक्तमतः परम्॥
कपिलं वामनं चैव तथैवोशनसेरितम्।
ब्रह्माण्डं वारुणं चाथ कालिकाह्वयमेव॥
माहेश्वरं तथा साम्बं सौरं सर्वार्थसंचयम्।
पराशरोक्तमपरं मारीचं भास्कराह्वयम्॥

एतत्सर्वमालोच्य विद्वद्भिः प्रतीयेत यद् यानि कैश्चिदुपपुराणत्वेनोक्तानि तान्येव विभज्य कैश्चिदौपपुराणत्वेन पृथग् गणितानि। वस्तुतः सर्वेषामेषामुपपुराणत्वेन गणनं युक्तं प्रतिभाति।

उपपुराणेषु प्रायेणैकैकां काञ्चिद्देवतामुद्दिश्य तन्माहात्म्यमेव विवृतं दृश्यते। यद्यपि महापुराणेष्वपीयं प्रक्रियोपलभ्यते, तत्रापि शैवपुराणेषु भगवतः शिवस्य, वैष्णवेषु पुराणेषु च भगवतो विष्णोर्माहात्म्यातिशयः ख्यापित इति, तथापि

उपपुराणेषु तु प्रक्रियेयमतिशयेन विजृम्भिना विलोक्यते। अत्र च परस्परं विरोधो नाशङ्कनीयः। यतो हि सर्वस्यापि चराचरात्मकस्य मूलभूतमेकं परब्रह्मैव मुख्यतयोपास्यं सर्वत्र विशिक्षितम्। तत्तु न स्वरूपेणोपासितुं शक्यम्—"यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह" "अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातमविजानताम्" "यन्मनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतं, तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते" इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिः तस्य वाङ्मनसाविषयतायाः स्पष्टमुद्घुष्टत्वात्। तस्मिन् मनोनिवेशो हि तदुपासनं भवति, यच्च मनोविषयतामेव नावगाहते तत्र मनोनिवेशः कथं कर्तुं शक्यः स्यात्। न वा स्तुतिः तस्य संभवति, वागतीतत्वात्। तथा च तदुपासना न संभवतोत्येव फलितम्। उपासनयैव मनुष्यजीवनस्य साफल्यम्, उपासना च न संभवतीति जीवनस्यैव निष्फलत्वमापतति, तद्वारणाय सगुणसाकाररूपाण्याधारीकृत्य तस्मिन्मनो निवेश्यमिति श्रुतिस्मृत्यादिषु मार्ग उपदिष्टः। तानि च सगुणसाकाररूपाणि अधिकारिभेदेन पञ्चशास्त्रेषु निर्दिष्टानि-यथा विष्णुः, शिवः, शक्तिः गणेशः, सूर्यश्चेति। ते हि देवाः स्वस्वाधिकारे नियुक्ताः स्वस्वकार्यं निर्वहन्ति। एषु कस्मिंश्चिदेकस्मिन् स्वरुचिमनुसृत्य ब्रह्मबुद्धिरुपासकेन कर्तव्या, तद्रूपं तेनोपासकेन परब्रह्मतया भावनीयम्, अन्यानि तु रूपाणि यथायथं स्वस्वाधिकारविशिष्टान्येव भावनीयानि।

तदित्थं येन यद्रूपं परब्रह्मतया भावितं तदेव तद्दृष्टौ सर्वतः प्रधानं स्यात्। अन्यानि तु रूपाणि यथास्थितानि तदनुगामीन्येव स्युः। अनेकेषु रूपेषु परब्रह्मतया भावितेषु तूपासनैव न सिध्येत्। चित्तस्यैकाग्रता हि उपासनायाः फलम्, अनेकेषु ब्रह्मतया भावितेषु तु इतस्ततः प्रचलच्चित्तं कथमेकाग्रं भवेत्। तस्माद् ब्रह्मबुद्धिरेकस्मिन्नेव कस्मिंश्चिद्रूपे कर्तव्या। इतरेषु तु न विद्वेषः कार्यः। अपितु यस्मिन् अधिकारे ते स्थिताः तादृशाधिकारविशिष्टत्वमेव तेषां मन्तव्यम्। तथा च परब्रह्मतया भावितस्य रूपस्याङ्गप्रत्यङ्गान्येव तेऽन्ये देवा भवेयुः। परब्रह्मतया भावितं तु रूपं सर्वतः प्रधानमित्येव पुराणेषूपपुराणेषु च कस्यचिदेकस्य प्राधान्यं तत्र तत्र ख्यापितम्। रुचिभेदकृतोऽधिकारभेद एवात्र निदानम्, न तु परस्परं कोऽपि विरोधः।

तदेतत् पातञ्जले योगसूत्रेऽप्युक्तम् "यथाभिमतध्यानाद्वा" इति। यस्या-

धिकारिणः स्वभावाद् यत्र रुचिः, तदेव रूपं तेन ध्यातव्यमिति तदर्थः। तदेव रूपं द्वारीकृत्य निर्विकल्पकसमाधिना तस्य ब्रह्मणि प्रवेशः स्यादिति योगसूत्राशयः।

तदित्थं विभिन्नतया मनोनिवेशार्थं स्वीकृतेषु रूपेषु भगवान् गणपतिरेवात्र पुराणे परब्रह्मरूपेण ध्यातुमुपदिष्टः। किञ्चिद्रूपं द्वारीकृत्य प्रवेशोऽपि मायाशबलिते ब्रह्मण्येव संभवति। निष्कलं तु ब्रह्म केवलमुपलक्षणतया निषेधमुखेनैव ज्ञेयं भवेत्। तदर्थं च निर्विकल्प एव समाधिरुपयुक्तः स्यादिति न तद् वाचा वर्णयितुं कथमपि शक्यम्, ततश्च मायाशबलितं ब्रह्मैव गणपतिरिति पुराणेऽस्मिन्नुपदिष्टम्।

माया च तस्य बुद्धिःसिद्धिरिति द्विविधा ख्यापिता। तत्र बुद्धिः चित्त-शब्देन पर्यायेणात्रोक्ता, पञ्चविधा सा चोक्ता। पञ्चविधत्वं च क्षिप्तं, मूढं, विक्षिप्तम्, एकाग्रं, निरुद्धमिति चित्तस्य टीकाकृता व्याख्यातम्। क्षिप्तं संसारिणां, मूढं भ्रान्तानां, विक्षिप्तं मुमुक्षूणां, विशेषेण ब्रह्मणि क्षिप्तमित्यर्थः एकाग्रं योगे प्रयतमानानां, निरुद्धं च योगिनामिति। एते भेदाः प्रायेण योगदर्शनादेव गृहीताः स्युः। चित्तपदं चेदं शास्त्रेषु बहुधा व्याख्यायते। सांख्यदर्शने मनो-बुद्धिरहङ्कार इति त्रिविधमेवान्तःकरणमुक्तम्। योगदर्शने तु चित्तपदमनेकसूत्रेषु व्यवहृतं दृश्यते। परं तदन्तःकरणपर्यायत्वेनैवोक्तमिति प्रतीयते। वेदान्ति-नश्च मनोबुद्धिरहङ्कारश्चित्तमिति चतुर्धान्तःकरणं व्याचक्षते। संकल्पं, व्यवसायम्, अहंभावं स्मृतिञ्चेति" एतादृशीं च वृत्तिं तेषामभिदधति।

अथागमशास्त्रे तु "चितिरेव चेतनपदादवरूढा चेत्यसंकोचिनी चित्तम्" (प्रत्यभिज्ञाहृदये, सू० ५) इति चित्तं व्याख्यातम्। तथा च चितिशक्तेः प्रथमः संकोचो बुद्ध्यपेक्षयापि सन्निकृष्टतरश्चित्तमिति प्रतीयते। इह तु बुद्धिपर्यायत्वेन चित्तशब्द उपात्तः। एभिश्च बुद्धिवृत्तिभेदैश्चित्तपदवाच्यैः यद् यत्प्राप्यते तत्सर्वं सिद्धिपदेनोच्यते। एता बुद्धिवृत्तयस्तत्फलानि चेत्युभयमपि संसारेऽन्तर्भूतमिति मायारूपमेवात्र निर्दिष्टम्। यद्यपि निरुद्धेन चित्तेन प्राप्तव्यो मोक्षो न मायाया-मन्तर्भावयितुं युक्तः। तथापि स मोक्षश्चरमवृत्त्यैव लभ्यः, ततः पूर्वं निरुद्धेनापि चित्तेन प्राप्या अणिमादिसिद्धयो मायायामेवान्तर्भवन्ति। वृत्तयस्तु सर्वा अपि मायान्तर्भूताः सन्त्येवेति बुद्धिः सिद्धिरिति भगवतो गणेशस्य द्वे माये अत्र व्याख्याते। गणपतेश्चापि रूपं जगद्विशिष्टब्रह्मतयैवात्र ख्यापितम्। शिरो

ब्रह्म तद्वरमङ्गन्तु जगदित्येकत्रोक्तम् । अपरत्र तु योगरूपेण गणपतिरुक्त इति कायः सविकल्पकसमाधिरूपेण, शिरश्च निर्विकल्पसमाधिरूपेण निर्दिष्टः। यदा गजः शुण्डादण्डं मुखे निवेश्य निमीलितनेत्रो भवति तदा मण्डलाकारं तन्मुखमेकरूपमेव प्रतीयते, न च तत्रावयवभेदः प्रतीयते इति निर्विकल्पकसाम्यं तत्राभिसंहितम् । केवलवेद्यविषयैकाकारैव तत्र वृत्तिर्भवतीत्येकदन्तरूपेण तदेव सूचितम् । काये तु विभिन्ना अवयवा प्रतीयन्त एवेति तस्य संसाररूपता प्रस्फुटैव । चतुर्भिश्च भुजैश्चतुर्दिग्व्याप्तिः सूच्यते । करेषु चिह्नानि च चतुर्विधपुरुषार्थसूचकानि । तत्र पाशोऽर्थरूपः, अर्थरूपेण पाशेनैव जीवानां विशेषतो बन्धनदर्शनात् । मोदकन्तु कामरूपम् तात्कालिकसुखरूपमोदहेतुत्वात् । अंकुशश्च धर्मरूपः नियन्त्रित्वेन धर्मस्याङ्कुशसाजात्येनैव प्रवृत्तिदर्शनात् । अथ कमलं जलस्थितमपि जलेन मनागपि न लिप्यते इति मोक्षरूपं तद्भगवतो हस्ते स्थितम् । एतांश्चतुरोऽपि पुरुषार्थान् यथाधिकारं सेवमानो भगवान् गणपतिः संसारिभ्यो ददातीति त एते तद्भुजस्थतया निर्दिश्यन्ते ।

अस्मिंश्च ग्रन्थे एकैकस्मिन् खण्डे गणपतेः एकैकन्नामाधिकृत्य तद् व्याख्या विशेषेण दर्शिता, यथा प्रथमखण्डे वक्रतुण्डनाम व्याख्या । द्वितीयखण्डे एकदन्तनामव्याख्या, तृतीये लम्बोदरनामव्याख्या, चतुर्थे गजाननामव्याख्येत्यादि । तत्र तृतीये लम्बोदरपदमित्थं व्याख्यातम्—गणपतेः कायः संसाररूप इत्युक्तं प्राक् । संसारिणाञ्चोदरं दुष्पूरं भवति । बहुतरभोगेऽपि तत्र शान्तेरदर्शनात् । अतएव गणपतेः बहुविस्तृतमुदरं मूर्तिषु दृश्यते । ब्रह्मरूपश्च गणपतिः संसारिणामुदरं प्रविश्य भुंक्ते ।

> अहं वैश्वानरो भूत्वा प्राणिनां देहमाश्रितः ।
> प्राणापानसमायुक्तः पचाम्यन्नं चतुर्विधम् ॥

इति भगवद्गीतायां गणपत्यभिन्नेन भगवता कृष्णेनाभिधानात् । तस्मात् परेषामुदरं प्रविश्य भोगकरणादपि तस्य महदुदरं ख्याप्यत इति । एवमत्र भगवतो गणेशस्य स्वरूपं स्थाने स्थाने निरूपितम् ।

तत्र तत्र कथाभिश्च भगवतो गणेशस्यैव पञ्चसु देवतासु प्राधान्यं ख्यापितम् । तथा हि सूर्यमण्डलमभितो निविष्टाः सूर्येण सहैव भ्राम्यन्तो बालखिल्या एकदा

सूर्यं पृष्टवन्तः यत् "सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुपश्च" "नूनं जनाः सूर्येण प्रसूताः" इत्याद्याभिः श्रुतिभिस्त्वमेव सर्वजगत्कारणं सर्वस्यात्मा चाम्नायसे । भवन्तमपि च ध्याननिरतं पश्यामः । तद्भवान् कमभिध्यायतीति नो मनसि जिज्ञासा समुदेति तां कृपया शमय इति ।

तदा सूर्यः "गणपतिरस्माकं सर्वेषामधिष्ठाता" स एव च परं ब्रह्म, तदाज्ञयैव वयं सर्वे तत्तत्कर्मसु प्रवर्तामहे । तमेवाहं सततमभिध्यायामि" इति तान् प्रबोधितवान् । निर्दिष्टवांश्च गणपतितत्त्वं प्रागुक्तम् । भूयश्च तन्माहात्म्यं सुस्पष्टं व्याचक्ष्व कृपयेति पृष्टः सन् स्वीयां कथां कथितवान् यत् कश्यपो मन्मन्त्रं जपन् मां सुचिरमाराधितवान् । तत्तपसा सुप्रसन्नश्चाहं यदा वरं प्रदातुं तत्समीपे गतः तदा स मां बहुतरं स्तुत्वा "त्वमेव मत्पुत्रतां याहि" इति वरं प्रार्थितवान् । अहञ्च प्रसन्नस्तस्मै तादृशमेव वरं दत्तवान् । एवमदित्यापि बहुतरं तपस्यन्त्या स एव वरो मत्सकाशाल्लब्धः । विश्वकर्मा च मत्पत्नीं संज्ञानाम्नीं तपसा समाराध्य "त्वं मे पुत्री भूयाः" इति वरं प्रार्थितवान् प्राप्तवांश्च । तथाहं कश्यपाददित्यां द्वादशभी रूपैरवतीर्णः । मत्पत्नी संज्ञा च विश्वकर्मणः पुत्रीत्वमगात् । तथापि विश्वकर्मणा सा मह्यं प्रदत्तेति आवयोः सम्बन्धो जातः । तया विहरंश्चाहं श्रुतिवाक्यैः स्वमेव सर्वश्रेष्ठतया मन्वानो गणपतिं व्यस्मार्षम् । तदा गणपतिना विघ्नः समुत्पादितः । स चेत्थंरूपो यन्माली सुमाली चेति द्वौ भ्रातरौ दैत्यकुले समुत्पन्नौ । ताभ्यां च तपसा शिवमाराध्य मत्तोऽप्यधिकप्रकाशं विमानमेकं प्राप्तम् । प्रकाशयन्तौ तौ रात्रिमेव व्यलोपयताम् । दिवा मत्प्रकाशः रात्रौ च तदीयविमानप्रकाशः इति सदैवैकविधप्रकाशसद्भावाद् रात्रिः केनापि न प्राज्ञायत ।

तदा च प्रातर्मध्याह्नादिकालस्याप्यज्ञानात्तत्कालविहितानि यज्ञादिकर्माण्यपि विलोपमेव गतानि । अहमेव च यज्ञाहुतिभिराप्यायितो भवामीति मदाप्यायनमपि यज्ञविलोपान्निवृत्तम् । एवंविधं व्यतिकरमालोक्य मया स्वतेजसा विमानेन सहैव तौ दैत्यावपि दग्धौ । तदा च स्वभक्तानां दाहात्कुपितेन शिवेन त्रिशूलेन मदीयं शिरश्छिन्नम् । तदा सर्वथैव वैदिकानां कर्मणां लोपो जातः । सर्वा अपि च प्रजा मत्सम्बद्धा इति तासामपि विनाश आपतितः । तदा च सर्वैर्ऋषिभिः संभूय भगवान् शिवः प्रार्थितो यत् किमिदं

भवता कृतम्। सूर्यं विना कथं प्रजानां स्थितिः संभवेत्। न चायं प्रलयकाल इत्यकाण्ड एव सर्वप्रलयः कथं भवता प्रारब्ध इति। तदा च शिवेन विचार्योक्तम्—गणपतिना समुत्पादितोऽयं विघ्न इति गणपतिमेवाराध्याहं सूर्यं जीवयिष्यामीति। अनन्तरञ्च भगवन्तं गणपतिं प्रसाद्य शिवेनोक्तम्—"यत्सूर्यं जीवय" अन्यथाहमपि स्वकीयं शिरश्छेत्स्यामीति, इत्थं विज्ञापितेन श्रीगणपतिना स्वीयं विघ्नमुपसंहृत्याहं जीवितं प्रापितः मदीयं शिरः पुनः कायेन योजितम्। पूर्वं छिन्नं मदीयं शिरश्च काश्यां लोलार्के निपतितमभूत्। तत्रैव चाहं जीवितः। पुनर्जीवितेन च मया चिन्तितं यत् श्रुतिर्मां सर्वस्यात्मानमाह आत्मनश्च कथं मृत्युः संभवेत्। तस्मान्नाहं सर्वस्यात्मेत्येवानुमीयते। न च मया सर्वे जनाः प्रसूताः। तस्माद्व्यर्थ प्रायोऽहमरण्यमेव गत्वा तपश्चरिष्यामीति। अरण्यं गन्तुं प्रवृत्ते च मयि ब्रह्मा समेत्य मां प्रबोधयाञ्चकार।

यच्छ्रुतिः सत्यमेवाह-अवश्यं भवान् सर्वस्य जगतः आत्मा भवतैव च सर्वा अपि प्रजाः पाल्यन्ते। परं सर्वेऽपि वयं ब्रह्मणः शासने तिष्ठामः। तच्छक्त्या च सर्वे वयं तच्छक्तिमन्तः। स ब्रह्मरूपो भगवान् गणपतिः सर्वैरस्माभिः समुपास्यः सेवनीयश्च। भवता गणपतिस्मरणं विस्मृतमिति तत एवायं विघ्नः समुत्पन्नः। इदानीं स्वाधिकारं सम्यङ्निर्वाहयता भवता सर्वाधिपतिर्गणपतिः सदा स्मरणीयः सेव्यश्चेति।

अस्यां कथायामिदं रहस्यं यत् कश्यपो नाम ऋषिरेकः, ऋषयश्च मौलिकाः प्राणाः, सर्वाधिभूता इति श्रुतिषु ख्याप्यते। तदुक्तं शतपथब्राह्मणे—"असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्, तदाहुः किं तदसदासीदित्यृषयो वाव तेऽग्रेऽसदासीत्तदाहुः के ते ऋषय इति प्राणा वाव ऋषयः" इति"। तेभ्य एव चाग्रे सर्वोत्पत्तिः समाम्नाता। भगवता मनुना चाप्युक्तम्—

ऋषिभ्यः पितरो जाताः पितृभ्यो देवदानवाः।
देवेभ्यश्च जगत्सर्वं चरन् स्थाण्वनुपूर्वशः॥ इति।

ततश्च ऋषिभ्य एव पितरो देवाश्च जायन्त इति फलितम्। तत एव च "काश्यपाः सकलाः प्रजाः" इति कश्यपस्य सर्वप्रजानिर्मातृत्वं पुराणादिषु ख्याप्यते। कश्यपश्चायं "कश्यपः पश्यको भवति" इति ब्राह्मणेषु निरुक्तः।

कूर्मोऽपि च जन्तुविशेषः कश्यप शब्देनाख्यायते। स च यथाङ्गानि संकोचयति विकासयति च, तथैव कश्यपनामा ऋषिरपि स्वाङ्गभूताः प्रजा बहिर्निःसारयति, समये संकोचयति चेति उभयोः सादृश्यम्। कूर्मस्य च पृष्ठभागः सुदृढो भवति, अधोभागश्चातिकोमलो-भवति। तथैव ब्रह्माण्डस्याप्येको भागः सूर्यातपान्निष्ठुरो भवति, अपरश्च मृदुरिति ब्रह्माण्डप्रतिकृतिरयं कूर्मः।

तदेतत्सर्वमालोच्याधोमुखोऽत एव सर्वमधःस्थितं पश्यन्निव प्राणविशेषः कश्यप इत्याख्यातः। ऊर्ध्वमध इति द्वेधा विभक्तस्याकाशस्योर्ध्वभागोऽदितिर्नाम अधोभागश्च दितिर्नाम। ते उभे अपि कश्यपस्य पत्न्यौ समाख्याते। तत्र प्रकाशमाने ऊर्ध्वभागे देवा उत्पद्यन्ते। अन्धकारितेऽधोभागे चासुराः। तदित्थं सर्वदैव घनभूतोऽत एव "चित्रं देवानामुदगादनीकम्" इति श्रुत्या देवानामनीकरूप-त्वेनाम्नातः सूर्योपि कश्यपाददित्यां जात इति स्पष्टीभवति। स च द्वादशसु-मासेषु पृथग्विधकार्यकरणाद् द्वादशरूप आख्यायते। सूर्यस्योदय एव सर्वेषां प्राणिनां चेष्टाः प्रवर्त्तन्ते इति चेष्टापरनाम्नी संज्ञा तत्पत्नीत्वेन पुराणेषूक्ता। अन्यत्र पुराणेषु सुरेणुरित्यपि तस्या नाम स्मर्यते सूर्यस्योदयकाले गवाक्षादिषु रेणव इव चलन्तः प्रतीयन्ते याः ('जालसूर्यमरीचिस्थं त्रसरेणूरजस्स्मृतम्') इत्यादि स्मृतिषु त्रसरेणुत्वेनाख्यायन्ते, एतदेवाभिप्रेत्य सुरेणोरपि सूर्यपत्नीत्वमाख्यातं द्रष्टव्यम्। तस्या अपसरणे च छायानाम्नी परापि स्त्री सूर्यपुराणेषूक्ता। प्रभाया अपसरणे छाया जायते। इति तदभिप्रायोऽपि स्फुटः। सा चेयं विश्वकर्मणः पुत्री इत्याख्याता। अत्र विश्वकर्मेति सर्वकरणशीलं सर्वशक्तिमत् पारमेश्वरमेवैकं रूपं द्रष्टव्यम्। तत एव च सर्वेषां प्राणिनां चेष्टाः प्रादुर्भ-वन्ति। व्यष्टिभूतानां जीवानां चेष्टायाः समष्टिरूपपरमात्माधीनत्वात्। सूर्यशिरश्छेदस्य चायमभिप्रायो यत् प्रत्येकस्मात्पदार्थाद् ये किरणा बहिर्गच्छन्ति ते सूचीमुखा भवन्ति, ते च मध्ये मध्ये संगत्य पुनस्तिर्यग् गच्छन्ति। तत एव दूरस्थं वस्तु जनैर्लघु प्रतीयते इति "छन्दोवेदनिरूपणे" गुरुवरैः श्री विद्यावाचस्पतिमहोदयैः स्पष्टं व्याख्यातम्। इदमेव श्रुतिषु क्वचिद् गायत्र्याः शिरश्छेदरूपेणाम्नायते। इह तु सूर्यशिरश्छेदरूपेणैवोक्तम्। किरणानां परस्परं संघर्षेण शिरच्छेद एव सूर्यशिरश्छेदत्वेनोक्तः, सूर्यकिरणानां सूर्याभिन्न-

त्वात् । सर्वं चेदं रुद्ररूपेण वायुना क्रियते इति रुद्ररूपशिवकृतत्वं शिरश्छेदस्योक्तम् । एवंविधैरागतैः किरणैरेव चन्द्रमसो दीप्तिर्जायते, स च रात्रावपि प्रकाशते इति रात्रावपि प्रकाशः कथायामुक्तः । सूर्यस्य शिवस्यापि च गणपत्याराधने हेतुस्तु पूर्वं विवृत एव गणपत्याराधकैर्गणपतेरेव परब्रह्मत्वेन विवक्षणादिति सर्वं यथायथं योज्यम् । काश्यां शिरःपतनादि तु लोलार्कतीर्थमहिमख्यापनार्थमेव द्रष्टव्यमिति । अग्रे च मोहस्योत्पत्तिवृत्तान्तं वालखिल्यैः पृष्टः सूर्यस्तान् बोधयामास — यदेकदा शिवो भगवान् वने एव तपश्चरन्नास्ते स्म । तदैव तारकासुरेण स्वस्वस्थानेभ्यः परिभ्रंशिता देवाः शिवस्य वीर्यादुत्पन्नेन कुमारेणैव हन्तव्य एव तारकासुर इति विज्ञाय कैलाशे पार्वतीसविधे गताः । सर्वञ्च वृत्तान्तं तस्यै न्यवेदयन् । तदा पार्वती भिल्लीरूपं विधाय वने शिवसन्निधौ गता । अतिसुन्दरेण च रूपेण तत्रैव वने पुष्पावचयादि कुर्वती विचरति स्म । समाधेर्व्युत्थानकाले च शिवस्तद्रूपं दृष्ट्वा मोहितो भूत्वा तां ग्रहीतुमधावत् । सा च ततो दूरीभवन्त्येव ततस्ततो विचरति स्म, न तद् हस्तगा बभूव । भूयोभूयस्तद्ग्रहणायोत्सुकः शिवस्तामन्वधावत् । एवमनुधावत एव शिवस्य वीर्यं चस्कन्द । तदेव च वीर्यं मोहरूपतामापद्यत । ततश्च परावृत्तेन शङ्करेण ध्यानं कृत्वा पार्वत्येवेयमासीदिति प्रत्यभिज्ञातम् । ततश्च स पार्वतीसविधे गत्वा देवानां च प्रार्थनां श्रुत्वा तया सह रन्तुमारेभे । मध्य एव कामस्यापि कथाऽत्र वर्णिता । एवं भिल्ल्यां कामवशगेन शङ्करेण क्रोधात्कामो भस्मीकृतः । पश्चाच्च यदा स पार्वतीसमीपमाजगाम, तदा कामं सस्मार "मह्यमङ्गं देहि यत्त्वया भस्मीकृतम्" इति तत्प्रार्थितश्च "गणपतिमाराधय स एव तुभ्यमङ्गं दास्यति" इत्युपदिश्य गणपतेरेकाक्षरं मन्त्रं तस्मै ददौ । तेन मन्त्रेण समाराधितश्च भगवान् गणपतिः प्रत्यक्षीभूय तस्य कानिचित्स्थानानि निर्दिष्टवान् । एवंविधेषु स्थानेषु त्वं वसेत्याज्ञापयाञ्चकार । अङ्गन्तु तव विष्णोरवतारभूतेन कृष्णेन दास्यते । स एव रुक्मिण्यां त्वामुत्पादयिष्यति । तत्रापि च तवेयं रतिरेव भार्या भविष्यतीत्यादिष्टवान् । इत्यादिः कामकथा मध्ये-एवात्र वर्णिता । तदनु कार्तिकेयजन्मकथापि प्रक्रान्ता बहुकालं पार्वत्या रममाणोऽपि भगवान् शङ्करो यदा न तृप्तिमगात् तदा देवैः प्रेरितो वह्निर्भिक्षुक-

वेषेण रममाणयोस्तयोः प्रदेशं गत्वा दूरस्थित एव भिक्षामयाचत तदा कश्चित् पुरुष आयात इति विज्ञाय पार्वतीपरमेश्वरावुत्थितावभूताम्। उत्थितमात्रस्य च शम्भोः वीर्यं भूमौ चस्कन्द।

तदादाय च पार्वती भिक्षारूपेण भिक्षुरूपाय वह्नये प्रददौ। वह्निस्तद-शित्वा दुर्जरत्वात् तदसहमानश्च गङ्गां गत्वा तत्रोद्गीर्णेण तच्चिक्षेप। तत्र स्नानार्थमागताश्च कृत्तिका जलेन सह तत्पपुः। ता अप्यसहमानाश्च शरस्तम्भे तदुद्गिरन्ति स्म। तत्रैव कुमारो जातः। कृत्तिकाभ्यो जातत्वादयं कार्तिकेय उच्यते। शरस्तम्भे च जातत्वात्-शरजन्मा। तं नारदो ददर्श। स च कैलाशं गत्वा पार्वतीं प्रति कुमारजन्माख्यातवान्। पार्वती तत्रागत्य तं पयः पाययामास। कृतसंस्कारश्च स सेनापतिर्भूत्वा देवैः सह तारकं हन्तुं जगाम। बहु युध्वापि हन्तुं न शशाक। तदा कथं हन्तुं शक्नुयामिति शम्भुं पप्रच्छ। शम्भुनोपदिष्टश्च गणपतिमाराधयाञ्चक्रे। 'आराधितश्च गणपतिः प्रत्यक्षीबभूव। कार्तिकेयेन सह बहुधा स्तुतः। अत्रैव स्तुतौ मूषकवाहन-स्यापि रहस्यमुक्तम्—यथा मूषकः पृथिव्यां प्रच्छन्न एव निवसति, प्रच्छन्न एव च बन्धनानि छिनत्ति, तदा त्वमपि सर्वेष्वन्तर्निगूढो निवससि। अविज्ञात्त एव भक्तानां बन्धनानि छिनत्सि' इति मूषकवाहनस्त्वमुच्यसे इत्यादि। गणपतिना दत्तवरश्च स पुनर्देवानां सेनापतिर्भूत्वा युद्धाय यातः तारकासुरं जघान चेति मध्य एव तारकासुरकथा पुराणान्तरसंवादिनी कथिता। केवलं गणपतितपश्चरण-मेवात्र विशेष उक्तः। अथाग्रे पुनर्मोहचरितमुपक्रान्तम्, शिववीर्यादुत्पन्नो मोहः दैत्यगुरुं शुक्रं शरणं गतः। तेनैव तस्य संस्काराः कृताः, सूर्याराधनोपदेशश्च दत्तः, तेनाराधितश्च सूर्यस्तस्मै वरान् ददौ, सूर्यात्प्राप्तवरश्च स दैत्यानामधि-पतिर्बभूव। प्रमादस्य सुतां मदिराञ्चोपयेमे। तस्यां तस्य उग्रः क्रूरः मेधावी शोचनो हरणश्चेति पञ्चसुता बभूवुः। विषयावास-नगरञ्च सूर्येणास्मै दत्तम्। क्रमेणायं सर्वेषां दैत्यानामधिपो भूत्वा स्वसुतान् तत्रतत्राधिपत्ये प्रतिष्ठा-पयामास। देवाश्च देवनिकायेभ्यो विवास्य तन्निकायेष्वपि स्वाधिकारमेवाकरोत्। अथ देवाः पराजिताः शम्भुसमीपे विष्णुसमीपे च गताः। सर्वे च सम्भूय गणपतिमेव शरणं याता। तैः प्रार्थितश्च गणपतिस्तं योद्धुं चलितः। नारदश्च

पुरैव दौत्येन तत्समीपं प्रस्थापयामास। स्वसमीपमागतं नारदमसौ सत्कारेण जग्राह। "त्वं सर्वत्र विचरसि। लोकस्य वार्तां ब्रूहि", इति तेन पृष्टश्च नारदः "गणपतिस्त्वां योद्धुमभियाति, त्वन्नगरात् कियद्दूरे अभिस्थितः। तत्परब्रह्मणा गणपतिना सह तत्र योधनमनुचितम्। त्वं तं शरणं प्रयाहि" इत्यादि जगौ। तेन पृष्टश्च गणपतेर्महिमानं तं प्रति व्याख्यातवान्। एवं प्रबोधितश्च मोहासुरो गणपतिं ययौ, तेनाज्ञप्तश्च देवेभ्यः स्थानानि दत्वा दैत्यैः सह पातालं विवेश इति मोहकथासंक्षेपः।

अथास्याः कथायाः निगूढाभिप्रायः प्रकटीक्रियते। अन्तरिक्षस्थाने रुद्रः द्वेधा श्रुतौ व्याख्यातः 'तस्य द्वे तन्वौ घोरास्या च शिवास्या च' तत्र शिव-तनुर्भगवान् सर्वैरुपास्यते, घोरतनुस्तु मूजवतोऽपि पर्वतात् परतो गन्तुं तत्र तत्र प्रार्थ्यते। तत्रेदं चरितं घोरतनोर्भगवतो रुद्रस्यैव। अतएव तस्य वने विचरणमेवात्र निर्दिष्टम्। अन्येषु पुराणेष्वपि च ब्रह्मणा यदा क्रुद्धेन रुद्र उत्पादितः, प्रजाः सृजेति चादिष्टः, यदा तेन स्वसदृशी भयङ्करी प्रजा स्रष्टु-मारब्धा, तदा ब्रह्मणा स्वसृष्टिकरणान्निवर्तितः इति तत्रतत्राख्यायते। एवं विधस्यैव रुद्रस्य वीर्येण मोहोत्पत्तिश्च वर्णिता। मोहस्य च प्रसर आसुरीष्वेव सृष्टिषु भवति, इति असुराचार्यस्यैव समीपे तस्य गमनमुपदिष्टम्। तस्य यादृशः परिवारो वर्णितः तेन स्वल्पबुद्धीनामपि आध्यात्मिकस्यैव मोहस्येयं रूपकविधया कल्पना कृतेति स्पष्टं भासेत। तथाहि प्रमादस्तस्य श्वशुर उक्तः। तत्कन्या च मदिरा मोहस्य पत्नीत्वेनोक्ता। मदिरयैव मोहः प्रवर्तते। मोहेन च मदिरापाने प्रवृत्तिरित्यन्योन्यसाहचर्यात् पत्नीत्वाख्यानं युक्तमेव। सुताश्च तस्य ये उक्ता ते मोहजनितावस्थाविशेषा एव—उग्रत्वं क्रूरत्वञ्च मोहेन मदिरया च जायते। 'मेधावी' इति पाठस्तु मोहपुत्रेषु भ्रमजनितोऽशुद्ध ए प्रतीयते, टीका-कृता तु नानाविधविषयस्मरणादसन्मेधाविशिष्ट इति व्याख्यातम्। अस्मन्मते तु "अमेध्याशी" इति मोहपुत्रेषु गणनं युक्तं प्रतिभाति। मोहेनैव अमेध्याशने प्रवृत्तिदर्शनात्। अन्ते च शोकमेवोत्पादयति मोहः, शोकार्तस्य च तत्तत्पदार्थ-हरणरूपं चौर्यमप्युत्पादयतीति पञ्चैते मोहपुत्राः स्थाने व्याख्याताः।

तस्य नगरं च विषयावासरूपं यन्निर्दिष्टं तदप्युचितमेव, मोहाक्रान्तानां विषयेष्वासक्तिदर्शनात्। प्रवृद्धश्च मोहोऽन्तःकरणे दैवीर्वृत्तीर्दानधर्मपरोपकाराद्या

उत्सादयतीति देवान् स्वस्थात् प्रचाव्य दैत्यानां तत्र निवेश सम्यगेव प्रतिपादितः। कामक्रोधहिंसादीनां वृत्तीनामेव मोहेन जननात्। एवंविधानां दैवीनामासुरीणाञ्च वृत्तीनां संघर्ष एव देवासुरयुद्धत्वेन श्रीशङ्कराचार्यैर्व्याख्यात उपनिषद्भाष्ये। एवञ्चिरं मोहराज्ये प्रवृत्ते सत्कर्म परिपाकवशात्पुनरपि दैवीनां वृत्तीनां कदाचिदुदयो भवत्येव। देवैः प्रार्थितश्च ज्ञानरूपो गणपतिर्यदा मोहमाक्रमितुं प्रवृत्तः तदा मोहः स्वयमपसृत इति युक्तमत्र प्रतिपादितम्। पातालगमनञ्च यदसुराणामत्रोक्तम्, तदाधिभौतिकदृष्ट्या, अधिभूतं हि देवानां त्रिलोक्यामावासः असुराणां च पाताले इत्येव पूर्वं ब्रह्मणा व्यवस्था कृतासीत्। तदेतन्मार्कण्डेय-पुराणे सप्तशतीपाठेऽपि देव्या उक्तम्—

त्रैलोक्यमिन्द्रो लभतां देवाः सन्तु हविर्भुजः।
यूयं प्रयात पातालं यदि जीवितुमिच्छथ।

इति मोहकथाया आध्यात्मिकं रहस्यम्।

मध्ये कार्तिकेयजन्मकथा च याऽत्रोक्ता तस्या अपीदं तात्पर्यमवसेयम्—यद् वह्नी रुद्रवीर्यत्वेनैव तत्र तत्र ख्याप्यते। कृशानुरेता इति रुद्रनामसु कोशेष्वपि पठ्यते। अन्तरिक्षस्थो विकृतो वायुरेव वह्निमुत्पादयति। "अग्नीषोमात्मकं जगदिति" जगन्मूलत्वेन परिभाषितयोरग्नीषोमयोर्मध्ये शुष्क-पदार्थानामग्नित्वेन आर्द्राणां च सोमत्वेन परिभाषणं द्रष्टव्यम्।

तदेवात्र वह्निपदेनोक्तम्। यद्—'आक्सिजन' नाम्ना परिभाषन्ते पाश्चात्या वैज्ञानिकाः, तस्यैव रुद्रवीर्यस्य वह्निना धारणमस्यां कथायामाख्यायते। जलेऽपि च तत्सम्बन्धादेव द्रवत्वमुत्पद्यते इति। जलेऽपि तद्भागरूपेण प्रविष्टं भवतीति वह्निना गङ्गायां तन्न्यसनमत्रोपवर्ण्यते। तारासु च कृत्तिकायां, तत्सम्बन्धः, अतएव कृत्तिका आग्नेयं नक्षत्रं व्याख्यायते।

अग्रे च सूर्यवंशश्चन्द्रवंशश्चाप्यत्र महापुराणवत् संक्षेपेणोक्तः। तत्र च रामकृष्णयुधिष्ठिरादीनामपि गणपत्युपासनं तत्र तत्र निर्दिष्टम्।

एवमस्माभिः कृतप्रवचनस्य तृतीयभागस्य सारोऽत्रातिसंक्षेपेण विवृतः। अयं च ग्रन्थो नाद्यावधि कुत्रापि मुद्रितः। लिखितमेव पुस्तकद्वितयमस्माभिः श्रीकाशिराजपुस्तकालयाल्लब्धम्। अस्मिंस्तु पुराणे योगविषय आगमशास्त्र-विषयश्चापि बहुतरं विवृतो दृश्यते।

THE DEVĪ-PURĀṆA, A WORK OF BENGAL

BY

R. C. HAZRA

['देवीपुराणं' नामोपपुराणं शाक्तानां प्राचीनतमः परं सम्मानितश्च ग्रन्थः। अयं पुराणग्रन्थो 'बङ्गाल' प्रदेशे रचित आसीदिति लेखेऽस्मिन् डा० हाजरामहोदयेन सप्रमाणं प्रतिपादितम्। एतदर्थं च इमे हेतवोऽत्रोपन्यस्ताः —(१) देवीपुराणस्य प्रायः सर्वे कोशाः (MSS.) वङ्गाक्षरेषु लिखिताः सन्ति, वङ्गदेशे एव च प्राप्यन्ते; (२) उत्कलदेशीयस्य 'एकाम्रपुराण'स्य उपपुराणसूच्यां, तथा वङ्ग-देशीयस्य रघुनन्दनकृत 'मलमासतत्त्व' नामकस्य ग्रन्थस्योपपुराणसूच्यामेव च देवीपुराणस्य नाम्न उल्लेखो विद्यते, नान्यत्र; (३) देवीपुराणे बङ्गदेशीयानां कामरूप-कामाख्या-राढ-वर्धमान-प्रभृतीनां स्थानानामुल्लेखो बाहुल्येन प्राप्यते; (४) देवीपुराणे शाक्ततीर्थेषु मध्ये वर्धमानमण्डल-स्थितस्य 'उज्जयिनी' नामकस्य स्थानस्य तदधिष्ठात्र्याः 'उज्जनी'ति नाम्न्याः (वङ्गेषु 'उजानी'ति प्रसिद्धायाः) देवतायाश्च समुल्लेखो वर्त्तते; (५) देवीपुराणे एव दुर्गापूजायां शत्रुबलेर्विधानं प्रथमं प्राप्यते, एषा प्रथा चाधुनाऽपि बङ्गालदेशे प्रचलति; (६) देवीपुराणे विन्ध्यवासिन्या देव्याः स्तोत्रं पूजाविधानं च वर्त्तते, दशकुमारचरिते च सुह्मेषु दामलिप्ताख्यस्य नगरस्य बाह्योद्याने वर्त्तमानस्य विन्ध्यवासिन्या आयतनस्योल्लेखो विद्यते, दामलिप्तं नाम नगरं च बङ्गालदेशस्याधुनिकं 'तामलुक' नामकं स्थानमेव; (७) देवीपुराणे अपाणिनीयप्रयोगानां बाहुल्यं विद्यते, एषां च प्रयोगानां वङ्गभाषायाः प्रयोगैः सहातीव साम्यमस्ति। एवम्, देवीपुराणस्य बङ्गालदेशे रचनाऽभूदिति सम्यक् सिध्यति।]

Among the extant Purāṇic works professing Śāktism, it is the *Devī-Purāṇa*[1] which is decidedly the most ancient as well as valuable and interesting from various points of view. Although this work came to attain an all-India character many centuries ago, being recognised as an authority in religious and social matters by many of the early Smṛti-writers of different parts of

1. Edited and published, with a Bengali translation, by the Vaṅgavāsī Press, Calcutta. Second edition, 1334 B. S.

India, and the conception of Devī, as found in this work, is in many respects different from that now prevalent in Bengal, there is little scope for doubt that it had its origin in this province. Besides the mention of the names of countries, rivers, holy places etc., mostly belonging to Northern India[2] and showing the relation of this Purāṇa with that part of the country, there are other evidences which point to Bengal as the place of its origin. These evidences may be stated as follows :

(1) Most of the extant manuscripts of the *Devī-p.* are found in Bengal and are written in Bengali script, and those which are now available at or near about Benares, might have been copied from their originals taken there from Bengal. In other parts of India, Mss. of this Purāṇa are very rare.

(2) Of the numerous lists of Upapurāṇas contained in different works it is only those given in the *Ekāmra-purāṇa* (a work of Orissa) and Raghunandana's *Malamāsa-tattva* (of Bengal) which include the name of the *Devī-p.*[3]

(3) The *Devī-p.* names, in some cases more than once, Kāmarūpa,[4] Kāmākhyā,[5] and the different parts of Bengal, viz , Vaṅga,[6] Rāḍha[7], Varendra,[8] Samataṭa[9], and Vardhamāna,[10] and thus shows its familiarity with and partiality for this part of Eastern India.

(4) Among the few chief holy places sacred to Devī this Purāṇa recognises and names Ujjayinī (a Śākta holy place in the district of Vardhamāna in West Bengal) and its presiding deity Ujjanī (popularly known as Ujānī),[11] which, being of local impor-

2. See *Devīp.*, chaps. 38, 39, 42, 46 (verses 63 ff.), 63, 74–76, and so on.

3. For these lists see my *Studies in the Upapurāṇas,* Vol. I, pp. 4–5 and 13.

4. *Devī-p.* 42. 8 ; 46. 71.

5. *Ibid.*, 39. 6 and 144.

6. *Ibid.*, 46. 69.

7. *Ibid.*, 39. 144.

8. *Ibid.*, 39. 144 ; 42. 9.

9–10. *Ibid.*, 46. 70.

11. See *Ibid.*, 38. 8–उज्जयिन्यां तु उज्जनी जम्बुमार्गे तथा स्थिता ।

tance, are found mentioned only in the works of Bengal.[12]

(5) The *Devī-p.* mentions 'Śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā in the following verse:

"तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायाच्छत्रुं कृत्वा तु पिष्टजम् ।
खड्गेन घातयित्वा तु दद्यात्स्कन्दविशाखयोः ॥" (22.16)

Curiously enough, this custom survives in Bengal even to the present day.

'Śatru-bali' as a malevolent rite is very ancient. In early days it was performed after pacificatory rites (śānti) by a King's priest with the use of *abhicāra-mantras* for the good of his royal patron. Varāhamihira mentions it in the following verse of his *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* (44. 21):

"शान्तिं राष्ट्रविवृद्ध्यै कृत्वा भूयोऽभिचारकैर्मन्त्रैः ।
मृण्मयमरिं विभिन्द्याच्छूलेनोरःस्थले विप्रः ॥"

"After performing the propitiatory rite for the growth (and prosperity) of the kingdom the (learned) Brahmin (priest) should, by citing Abhicāra-mantras again, thoroughly pierce with a lance at its chest (the effigy of) an enemy made of clay."

---

12. 'Ujjayinī', mentioned in *Devī-p.* 38. 8 (quoted in the immediately preceding footnote), is the same as the ancient city, popularly known as 'Ujānī', which comprised the modern villages of Kogram, Maṅgalkoṭ (Sanskrit—मङ्गलकोष्ठक) and Ārāl situated on the bank of the river Ajaya in Katwa sub-division in the district of Burdwan (Vardhamāna) in West Bengal. It has been mentioned, sometimes under its popular name 'Ujānī', in the works of Bengal as one of the Mahāpīṭhas created by the fall of the different parts of Satī's body severed by Viṣṇu, and Devī is said to reside here under the name of 'Ujānī.'

For mention of this sacred city see *Bṛhad-dharma-p.* I. 14. 14, in which Devī says:

"उज्जयिन्यां तथा पुर्यां पीठं मङ्गलकोष्ठकम् ।
शुभा मङ्गलचण्ड्याख्या यत्राहं वरदायिनी ॥"

See also *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, *Tantra-cūḍāmaṇi*, *Pīṭha-nirṇaya* (*alias Mahāpīṭha-nirūpaṇa*), Bhārata-candra's *Annadā-maṅgala* (Pīṭha-mālā, verse 21), and so on.

For an excellent account of the Śākta Pīṭhas (including the said 'Ujjayinī' or 'Ujānī' of Bengal) see *JASB*, XIV, 1948, pp. 1–108.

But the association of 'śatru-bali' with Durgā-pūjā is of comparatively late date. So far as we have been able to find, it is our *Devī-p.* which is the earliest extant work to mention this rite in connection with Durgā-pūjā. The other comparatively early Purāṇic works to prescribe it are the present *Agni-*[13] and *Garuḍa-purāṇa*, the *Mahābhāgavata* and the *Kālikā-p.* Of these, the *Agni-p.* (185. 13-14) says in connection with the worship of sixteen- or eighteen- handed Durgā annually on the Mahānavamī Tithi:

"तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायाच्छत्रुं पिष्टमयं हरेत् ।
दद्यात्स्कन्दविशाखाभ्यां ... ... ॥"

"In her (i. e. Devī's) presence the king should take his bath, destroy (the figure of) an enemy made of powdered rice, and give (it) to Skanda and Viṣākha ... ..."
In much the same words (especially as those of *Devī p.* 22.16) the *Garuḍa-p.* also says in the same connection :

"तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायाच्छत्रुं कृत्वा च पैष्टजम् ।
खड्गेन घातयित्वा तु दद्यात्स्कन्दविशाखयोः ॥"[14]

It is to be noted that these two verses of the *Agni* and the *Garuḍa-p.* (and more particularly that of the latter) agree very much with *Devī-p.* 22.16 quoted above, and have even the incorrect Saṃdhi in 'तस्याग्रतः' (for 'तस्याः अग्रतः') like the *Devī-p.* Moreover, chap. 134 of *Garuḍa-p.* I, which also deals with Durgā-pūjā on the Mahānavamī Tithi, has one line (6b) tallying completely with *Devī-p.* 22, 10a and two more (6a and 7a), agreeing remarkably with *Devī-p.* 22, 9a and 10b respectively. So, there is little doubt about the fact that both the *Agni* and

13. This is a spurious work available in more printed editions than one and quite different from the genuine *Āgneya-p.* still surviving in Mss. under the title '*Vahni-p.*' For information about this genuine *Āgneya-p.* (*alias Vahni-p.*) see my article published in *Our Heritage*, I, 1953, pp. 209-245 and II, 1954, pp. 77-110, and *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, V, 1955-56, pp. 411-416.

14. *Garuḍa-p.* (ed. Vaṅgavāsī Press, Calcutta), I. 135. 3.

the *Garuḍa-p.* modelled their verses on 'śatru-bali' on that of the *Devī-p.*

Now, the *Agni-p.* was compiled either in the eastern part of Orissa or in the western part of West Bengal (and most probably in the latter)[15], and the *Garuḍa-p.* originated in Mithilā. but most likely in that part of Bengal which was adjacent to Mithilā.[16]

Of the *Mahābhāgavata* and the *Kālikā-p.* the former, which mentions the rite of 'śatru-bali' in the verse

"ततः शत्रुं बलिं दद्यात्कृत्वा पिष्टमयं मम ।
नवम्यां पूजिताहं तु बलिभिर्विविधैरपि ॥" (45.33),

was written in Bengal (most probably in its eastern part) some time during the tenth or eleventh century A. D., and the latter, which gives a description of the rite in chap. 71, verses 177 ff., was compiled in the tenth or the first half of the eleventh century A D. either in Kāmarūpa or in that part of Bengal which was very near to it.

Again, the earliest Smṛti work to mention the said rite of 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā is Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtya-kalpataru* but its only authority is the *Devī-p.*, from which it quotes, in its Rājadharma-Kāṇḍa, pp. 192–195, verses 3-24 of chap. 22 (including the verse on 'śatru-bali'). In his *Durgotsava paddhati* Udayasiṃha Rūpanārāyaṇa also quotes many verses from the *Devī-p.* and says :

अनन्तरं शत्रुप्रतिमां पिष्टमयीं कृत्वा खड्गेन तच्छिरश्छेदयित्वा 'ओं स्कन्दाय नमः' इति स्कन्दाय शिरो दत्त्वा 'ओं विशाखाय नमः' इति विशाखाय कबन्धं दद्यात् ।"[17]

Although Udayasiṃha Rūpanārāyaṇa does not quote *Devī-p.* 22, 16 (on 'śatru-bali'), his wordings show definitely that his authority for this rite was the *Devī-p.* In his *Vidhāna-pārijāta* (II, p. 651) Ananta-bhaṭṭa also quotes the said verse of the

15–16. We shall discuss the questions of provenance of the present *Agni-* and *Garuḍa-p.* on another occasion.

17. See Asiatic Society (Calcutta) Ms. No. 6445 (Indian Museum Collection), fol. 15b.

Devī-p. (and no other authority) in connection with 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā.

In Eastern India it is the *Saṃvatsara-pradīpa* which is the earliest Smṛti work to include this rite in the annual worship of Durgā. It was written in the twelfth century A. D. by Halāyudha, a high state-officer in charge of religious affairs under king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal; and its relevant lines (given without quoting authority) run as follows :

"ततो·········शालिपिष्टकशत्रुप्रतिकृतिं निर्माय मण्डपद्वारपार्श्वे उत्तरशिरसं संस्थाप्य लोहितपुष्पेण संपूज्य तीक्ष्णखड्गम् आदाय अमुकामुकं मारयामीति छित्त्वा स्कन्दविशाखाभ्यां नम इति निवेदयेत् ।"[18]

There is also another Smṛti work of Bengal, viz., the *Durgā pūjā-paddhati* of Vidyābhūṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya, in which there is mention of 'śatru-bali'.[19] Of the Smṛti-writers of Mithilā it is Caṇḍeśvara and Vidyāpati who mention 'śatru-bali' in their *Kṛtya-ratnākara* (pp. 353, 360) and *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī* (pp. 35, 197) respectively, the authority cited by them on this rite being the *Devī-p.* only. The influence of the Bengal Nibandhas on the sections on Durgā-pūjā in Caṇḍeśvara's *Kṛtya-ratnākara* and Vidyāpati's *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī* is obvious. It is specially remarkable that in all cases the non-Bengal Nibandhas use the *Devī-p.* as their only authority on 'śatru-bali', that all the Purāṇas, except the *Devī*, which mention this rite, connecting it with Durgā-pūjā, belong either to Bengal or to places very near to it, and that this rite is found to be followed in some form or other in Bengal even at the present day. From all this it appears that both the rite of 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā and the *Devī-p.* recording it originated in Eastern India and very likely in Bengal.

(6) Although the *Devī-p.* mentions 'Kāmarūpa' and 'Kāmākhyā' as places of Devī-worship, it does not add any importance to these, nor does it betray any influence of the method of Devī-worship followed in these places. On the other hand, it concerns itself with the praise and worship of Vindhyavāsinī (of whom,

18. See Dacca University Ms. No. 4632, fol. 25b.

19. See Dacca University Ms. No. 2258 (dated Śaka 1658), fols. 46b.-47b.

as the *Daśakumāra carita* tells us, there was a famous temple at 'Dāmalipta' or Tamluk,[20] and the importance of Kāmarūpa as a place of Śakti-worship and its influence on Bengal became more and more prominent in the later Purāṇic works such as the *Kālikā-p.*, *Mahābhāgavata* and *Bṛhad-dharma-p.*

(7) Unlike all other works of the Purāṇic literature, the *Devī-p.* is written in highly incorrect Sanskrit which compares very favourably with the language of the *Mahāvastu*, *Lalita-vistara* and other Buddhist Sanskrit works of East Indian origin.[21] So, there can be little doubt about the fact that the *Devī-p.* also had its origin in Eastern India.

(8) In the *Devī p.* there are many words and expressions which are clearly based on those in popular use in Bengal. As instances, only a few are noted below.

(a) The inflected form 'devyā' of 'devī' has been used in a large number of places as a basic word and declined like 'latā' and other feminine words ending in 'ā'. (It should be mentioned here that in rural Bengal the word 'devyā' for 'devī' is popularly used as a surname of Brahmin words even at the present day). Similarly, 'mātā', 'duhitā', 'trātā', 'hotā' etc. have been used on several occasions as basic words respectively for 'mātṛ', 'duhitṛ', 'trātṛ', 'hotṛ' etc.

(b) As in Bengali, the word 'saṃmata' has been used to mean 'the *person* who has agreed or given his consent' (and not 'the *matter* agreed upon or consented to') in *Devī-p.* 7. 96—एवं ताः संमतीकृत्वा·········। नियुक्ताः शंभुना·········॥ (Cf. Bengali—'सम्मत करिया').

(c) Like the word 'Ki' used for 'Kiṃ vā' in Bengali, the *Devī-p.* uses 'Kim' in 8. 12—·········द्वारे·········। नारदस्तिष्ठते देव स्थाप्यतां किं प्रवेश्यताम् ॥

20. See *Daśa-Kumāra-Carita* (ed. M. R. Kale, Bombay), p. 149—
··········सुह्मेषु दामलिप्ताह्वयस्य नगरस्य बाह्योद्याने···············आयतने विस्मृतविन्ध्यरागवासं वसन्त्या विन्ध्यवासिन्याः ....।

21. The results of my studies in the language of the *Devī-p.* are going to be published very soon.

Cf. Bengali—देख, ··· द्वारे ···· नारद अवस्थान करितेछेन, [ताँहाके सेखानेइ] राखिते हइबे कि प्रवेश कराइते हइबे ? (Note the word 'स्थाप्यताम्' for Bengali 'राखिते हइबे').

(d) The verbal forms 'uttha' (for 'uttiṣṭha') in *Devī-p.* 8. 17 (उत्थ राजन् महाबाहो ····) and 'karanti' (for 'kurvanti') in *Devī-p.* 35. 27 (··· बाधां करन्ति च) are very similar to their Bengali equivalents 'उठ' (rise) and 'करे' (present tense, third person, plural number of the Bengali root 'करा' for Sanskrit 'कृ').

(e) As in Bengali, the Sanskrit root 'bhuj' (meaning 'to enjoy') has been used in the form 'bhuñj' in many places of the *Devī-p.* see, for instance, *Devī-p.* 2. 42 (स्वर्गभूसप्तपातालान् भुञ्ज त्वं ····), 2. 49, 5. 16 (भुञ्ज स्वर्गम्), 4. 10 (भूपातालानि भुञ्जथ), 9. 12 (भुञ्जते पृथ्वीम्), 9. 36 (बाला भुञ्जनीया), 9. 39 (भुञ्जन् पृथ्वीम्), and so on.

(f) On numerous occasions nouns derived from verbal roots by means of Kṛt affixes denoting action have been allowed to govern objects having the second case-ending. For instances of such use we may refer to *Devī-p.* 1. 57 (श्रवणात् ···· पुराणं शिव-भाषितम्, in which the word 'श्रवण' governs the Accusative Case in 'पुराण'), 8. 57 (कन्यामुद्वहनोपरि—about marrying the girl), 9. 42 (तामुद्वाहसमुत्सुकः—eager to marry her), 9. 50 (विद्या मोहनशीला या ससुरासुरमानवान्), 11. 23 (दिवमुत्सहते जये), 13. 22 (अस्थीनि दर्शनम्), and so on. Similar use of Kṛdanta nouns denoting action is very common in Bengali and has its root in the Vedic literature, in which there are a few instances, viz., *Ṛg-veda* viii. 11.7—अग्ने त्वांकामया गिरा (which Sāyaṇācārya explains as 'त्वांकामया त्वाम् अभिलषन्त्या गिरा स्तुत्या), *Atharva-veda* vi. 139. 2, 4—मां कामेन ··· — by loving me (Whitney), *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* ii. 3. 1. 16—यद्येनं क्षीरं केवलं पानेऽस्याभवेत्—if it should happen to him to have to drink pure milk (Eggeling), and so on.

(g) 'ज्वलन्त' (for 'ज्वलत्') has been used as a basic word in *Devī-p.* 14. 27—ज्वलन्तकोपाः. Cf. Bengali—'ज्वलन्त आगुन'—blazing fire, 'चलन्त गाडी'—moving car, 'घुमन्त शिशु'—sleeping child, and so on.

(h) As in Bengali, the word 'पूर्वे' (with the seventh case-ending) has been used in *Devī-p.* 6. ii. 1 (मया पूर्वे च त्वं देव उक्तमासीत्…) in the sense of 'formerly'.

(i) In several places of the *Devī-p.* the seventh case-ending has been used in place of the fourth in the Dative Case. See for instance, *Devī-p.* 11. 7-11 (वसिष्ठेनापि सा दत्ता …… … सारस्वते ; वहुवृचस्तारुणे ददौ, 'तारुणे' being used for 'ताम् आरुणे' ; and so on), 106. 5 (देव्या भक्ते प्रदातव्यम्).

Cf. Bengali— '…बाप दिला हेन वरे' — (my) father gave me to such a bridegroom…… ; सत्पात्रे दान करा उचित —(one) should make gifts to a good recipient ; and so on.

(j) As in Bengali, words have sometimes been used in different cases without any case-ending at all. See, for instance, *Devī-p* 3. 12, 21 (महासंग्राम चक्रिरे), 14. 20 ("वामं भुज पूरयित्वा…धावति क्रुद्ध कोपात्), 14. 25 (तथापि कालो गदा तां मुमोच), 14. 27 (एवं स कालो हत भैरवश्च…… ……), and so on.

From the evidences adduced above it is clear that the *Devī-p.* was an East Indian work originating in Bengal. The use of the simile of ships (पोत) in more places than one in this Purāṇa[22] tends to show that it was written somewhere about Tamluk, where, as we have already seen from the *Daśa-kumāra-carita*, there was a famous temple of Vindhyavāsinī and whence ships were sent to distant countries outside India.

22. Devī-p. 72–73 ('पोती पोतस्य वा यथा' used in connection with the maintenance of a fort by its owner) ; 77. 3 ("शिवपोतं तु तेन पारं भवार्णवात्) ; 83.112 (दैत्यौघमज्जमानानां त्वं पोता भव शूलिनी).

श्रीवराहपुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायश्च

पं. के० वि० नीलमेघाचार्यः

[The learned writer has here discussed the relation of the *Varāha-Purāṇa* and the *Rāmānuja-Sect* of Vaiṣṇavism. The Varāha-Purāṇa has been the principal Purāṇa of the Rāmānuja-Sect, and so it has been profusely drawn upon in the works of this Sect.

The writer has shown that many of the important religious and philosophical tenets of the Rāmānuja-Sect are contained in the Varāha-Purāṇa. He traces in the present Varāha-Purāṇa a number of the Ślokas quoted by Rāmānuja and Vedāntadeśika in their works. Still, there are many ślokas found in the works of the Rāmānuja-Sect, which are mentioned as quoted from the Varāha-Purāṇa, but which are not actually traceable in the available editions of this Purāṇa. Such ślokas, in the opinion of the writer, either might have been lost from the Varāha-Purāṇa or might be traced in the Southern Mss. of this Purāṇa, which have not yet been utilised for preparing its editions.

The learned writer has also discussed the question whether the Varāha-Purāṇa was ever composed or redacted by the followers of the Rāmānuja-Sect. He says that the Sanskrit-works of the Rāmānuja-Sect (which are called the *Sadasya-granthas*) are meant to propagate the doctrines of this sect among the scholars of the opposite fold also, and so they mainly draw upon the works which are recognised by both the parties. And as these *Sadasya-granthas* have mainly drawn upon the Varāha-Purāṇa, this Purāṇa, therefore, could not be

confined to the Rāmānuja-Sect only. Again, this Purāṇa contains several statements and doctrines which are opposed to those of the Rāmānuja-Sect; e. g., the doctrines of unity or identity of the three Gods of the Trinity and performance of *sakāma* karmas, both preached by the Varāha-Purāṇa, are opposed to the main doctrines of the Rāmānuja-Sect which preaches the doctrine of superiority of God Viṣṇu over Brahmā and Rudra both, and abhors the performance of *sakāma* karmas. All this shows that the Varāha-Purāṇa was not composed or even redacted by the followers of the Rāmānuja-Sect, but had been composed by sages like Vyāsa long before the inception of this Sect.]

अष्टादशसु पुराणेषु श्रीवराहपुराणं द्वादशं गण्यते। तथा च श्रीविष्णुपुराणे तृतीयेंऽशे षष्ठेऽध्याये वचनं "वाराहं द्वादशं चैव" इति। इदं सात्त्विकपुराणेष्वन्यतमम्। तथा च पद्मपुराणवचनं—

"वैष्णवं नारदीयं च तथा भागवतं शुभम्।
गारुडं च तथा पाद्मं वाराहं शुभदर्शने।
सात्त्विकानि पुराणानि विज्ञेयानि शुभानि वै॥" इति।

नारदीये वराहपुराणविषये वर्ण्यते

"शृणु पुत्र प्रवक्ष्यामि वाराहं वै पुराणकम्।
भागद्वययुतं शश्वद्विष्णुमाहात्म्यसूचकम्॥"
"मानवस्य तु कल्पस्य प्रसङ्गं मत्कृतं पुरा।
निबबन्ध पुराणेऽस्मिन् चतुर्विंशत्सहस्रके॥" इति।

एतद्वचनवर्णितानि भागद्वययुतत्वविष्णुमाहात्म्यसूचकत्वमानवकल्पवृत्तवर्णनाधिकृतत्वरूपाणि वराहपुराणस्य लक्ष्माणि एतल्लेखे आकरप्रदर्शनाद्यर्थं परिगृहीते कलिकातासंस्कृतकालेजाध्यापकेन श्रीहृषीकेशशास्त्रिणा संशोध्य प्रकाशितेऽस्मिन् वराहपुराणग्रन्थे संघटन्ते। परं तु अनेन वचनेन श्रीमद्भागवते द्वादशस्कन्धेऽन्तिमेऽध्याये विद्यमानेन "चतुर्विंशति वाराहम्" इति वचनेन च ज्ञापिता

चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रात्मिका ग्रन्थसंख्या सांप्रतिकेऽस्मिन् वराहपुराणे नोपलभ्यते, किं तु द्वादशसहस्रात्मिकैव ग्रन्थसंख्योपलभ्यते। तेनावधार्यते प्राचीनस्य वराहपुराणस्यार्धभाग एव सांप्रतमुपलभ्यते, अर्धभागो लुप्त इति। अथवा यत इदं वराहपुराणं श्रीहृषीकेशशास्त्रिलिखितभूमिकानुसारेण उत्तरदेशीयलिखितपुस्तकत्रयमवलम्ब्यैव संशोध्य प्रकाशतां नीतम्, दक्षिणादिदेशीयलिखितपुस्तकानि संशोधनकर्मणि न जगृहिरे अत एव पूर्णशरीरं वराहपुराणं न संलक्ष्यते। दक्षिणादिदेशस्थलिखितप्राचीनपुस्तकान्यप्यवलम्ब्य तत्रत्याध्याययोजनपूर्वकं यदि वराहपुराणं मुद्राप्येत तर्हि वराहपुराणस्य प्रायश्चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रसंख्याकग्रन्थपरिमिततापि संभाव्यते। दक्षिणदेशस्थैः श्रीवैष्णवसंप्रदायाचार्यैराकरनिर्देशपूर्वकमुद्धृतानां श्रीवराहपुराणवचनानां बहूनामस्मिन् वराहपुराणग्रन्थेऽनुपलम्भोऽपीमां संभावनामुपोद्बलयति। किंचास्मिन् वराहपुराणे पुराणेष्ववश्यवर्णनीयत्वेनादृतेषु सर्गादिषु पञ्चसु अर्थेषु केषांचिद्वर्णनं च यद् दृश्यते तेनापि पुराणस्यापूर्णता स्फुटीभवति। अस्मिन् पुराणे सृष्टिप्रकारः श्राद्धमहिमा तदनुष्ठानप्रक्रिया प्रथमादितिथिषु तत्तद्देवताराधनं प्रतिद्वादशि विष्णुपूजनप्रकारभेदो नानातीर्थमहिमा वर्णाश्रमधर्माः पापफलनानानरकानुभवप्रकारो नानादानमहिमा देवताराधकनानाभक्तचरितानीत्यादयोऽर्थाः प्रतिपाद्यन्ते। बाहुल्येन श्रीविष्णुमाहात्म्यं वैष्णवधर्माश्च वर्ण्यन्ते। इमेऽर्थाःसर्वेषां सनातनधर्मानुयायिनां संप्रतिपन्नाः। वैष्णवसंप्रदायानुयायिनस्तु सुतरामेतानर्थान् संप्रतिपद्यन्ते।

अथ श्रीवराहपुराणं रामानुजसंप्रदायं चाधिकृत्य विचार्यते किमनयोगाढसम्बन्धोऽस्ति नवेति। तदर्थमिदं विमृश्यते श्रीवराहपुराणोदिताः के के प्रधानार्थाः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियन्ते? श्रीवराहपुराणस्थानि कानि वचनानि श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिषु ग्रन्थेषु प्रमाणत्वेनोद्धृतानि? तेषु कियन्ति अस्मिन् कलिकातामुद्रिते वराहपुराणे समुपलभ्यन्ते कियन्ति च नेति? अनुपलम्भस्य को हेतुः? श्रीवराहपुराणस्य श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायाचार्यैरतिशयेनाद्रियमाणत्वे किं निबन्धनम्? किमिदं पुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिः प्राचीनैराचार्यैर्निर्मितं परिवर्धितं वेति शक्यशङ्कमुत नेति?

अथ श्रीवराहपुराणोदिताः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीकृता अर्थाः स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन संगृह्यन्ते।

(१) नारायणस्य जगत्कारणत्वप्रतिपादनपरया "एको ह वै नारायण आसीत् न ब्रह्मा नेशानो नापो नाग्नीषोमौ नेमे द्यावापृथिवी न नक्षत्राणि न सूर्यो न चन्द्रमाः, स एकाकी न रमेत" इत्यादिकया महोपनिषदा प्रतिपादितं श्रीवराहपुराणस्थैः

"पूर्वं नारायणस्त्वेको नासीत् किंचिद् धरे परम् ।
सैक एव रतिं लेभे नैव स्वच्छन्दकर्मकृत् ॥" (अ० ९, श्लो० २)
"ससर्ज सर्वभूतानि यथा नारायणात्मकः ।
कथ्यमानं मया देवि तदशेषं क्षिते शृणु ॥" (अ०२, श्लो० २२)
"आपो नारा इति प्रोक्ता आपो वै नरसूनवः ।
अयनं तस्य ताः पूर्वं तेन नारायणः स्मृतः ॥" (अ० २, श्लो० ३६)
"सर्वे देवाः सपितरो ब्रह्माद्याश्चाण्डमध्यगाः ।
विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूता इतीयं वैदिकी श्रुतिः ॥" (अ० १७,श्लो.२३)
"यदेतत्परमं ब्रह्म वेदवादेषु पठ्यते ।
स देवः पुण्डरीकाक्षः स्वयं नारायणो हरिः ॥" (अ० ३९, श्लो० १५)
"नारायणात्परो देवो न भूतो न भविष्यति ।
एतद्रहस्यं वेदानां पुराणानां च सर्वशः ॥" (अ७३, श्लो०५०)

इत्येभिर्वचनैरुपबृंह्यमाणं नारायणस्य जगत्कारणत्वं परब्रह्मरूपत्वं च श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते । अत्र स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयेशितृत्वं "नारायण त्वयि न मृष्यति वैदिकः कः" इति स्तोत्ररत्नपद्यं श्रीरामानुजगीताभाष्यावतरणिकास्थः "परंब्रह्म पुरुषोत्तमो नारायणः" इति व्यपदेशश्च निदर्शनम् । अत्रोदाहृतम् "आपो नारा इति प्रोक्ताः" इति वचनं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायाचार्येण श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकेन विरचिते रहस्यत्रयसारे मूलमन्त्राधिकारे समुद्धृतमवलोक्यते । इदं वचनं मनुस्मृतावप्युपलभ्यते । "सर्वे देवाः सपितरः" इति वाराहवचनं श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकविरचिते स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयेशितृत्वम्" इति पद्यस्य व्याख्यायां समुद्धृतं दृश्यते । "यदेतत्परमं ब्रह्म" इति वाराहवचनं तस्मिन्नेव स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "तत्त्वेन यः" इति पद्यस्य व्याख्यायां समुद्धृतं संलक्ष्यते । "नारायणः परो देवः" इति वाराहवचनं स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "कस्योदरे" इति श्लोकस्य व्याख्यायामुदाहृतमध्यक्ष्यते ।

(२) श्रीवराहपुराणे—

"सृष्ट्वा नारस्ता अथो तत्र चाहं येनैव स्यान्नाम नारायणेति ।

कल्पे कल्पे तत्र शयामि भूयः सुप्तस्य मे नाभिजः स्याद्यथाद्य ॥

"एवंभूतस्य मे देवि नाभिपद्मे चतुर्मुखः ।

उत्तस्थौ स मया प्रोक्तः प्रजाः सृज महामते ॥" (अ० २, श्लोक १२, १३)

इति वचनाभ्यां प्रतिपादिता नारायणाच्चतुर्मुखस्य ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायेऽभ्युपगम्यते । अत्र "परं ब्रह्म पुरुषोत्तमो नारायणो ब्रह्मादिस्थावरान्तं जगत्सृष्ट्वा" इति श्रीरामानुजगीताभाष्यावतरणिकास्थं वाक्यं निदर्शनम् । श्रीरामानुजविरचिते श्रीभाष्याभिधे ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्ये इदं वचनद्वयं "तथाऽऽदिसर्गमहं वक्ष्ये" इत्यारभ्योच्यते—

"सृष्ट्वा नारं तोयमन्तःस्थितोऽहं येन स्यान्मे नाम नारायणेति ।

कल्पे कल्पे तत्र शयामि भूयः सुप्तस्य मे नाभिजं स्याद्यथाब्जम् ॥"

"एवं भूतस्य मे देवि नाभिपद्मे चतुर्मुखः ।

उत्पन्नः स मया चोक्तः प्रजाः सृज महामते ॥"

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ ईषत्पाठभेदेन समुद्धृतं संलक्ष्यते । श्रीभाष्योदाहृतः पाठः समीचीन इति परामर्शे क्रियमाणे विज्ञायते । अस्यां पङ्क्तौ उद्धृतम् "आदिसर्गमहं वक्ष्ये" इति वचनं वराहपुराणे "आदिसर्गमहं तावत्कथयामि वरानने" (अ० २, श्लोक ५) इत्येवमवलोक्यते । श्रीभाष्ये देवताधिकरणे तथा "परो नारायणो देवस्तस्माद्यातश्चतुर्मुखः" इत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये उद्धृतमिदं वचनमपि वराहपुराणान्तर्गतमेव । इदं वचनं वराहपुराणे—

"परो नारायणो देवस्तस्माज्जातश्चतुर्मुखः ।

तस्माद्रुद्रोऽभवद्देवि स च सर्वज्ञतां गतः ॥" (अ० ९०, श्लो० ३)

इत्येवं संलक्ष्यते ॥

(३) श्रीवराहपुराणे—

"परो नारायणो देवस्तस्माज्जातश्चतुर्मुखः ।

तस्माद्रुद्रोऽभवद्देवि स च सर्वज्ञतां गतः ॥" (अ० ९०, श्लो० ३)

"आद्यो नारायणो देवस्तस्माद् ब्रह्मा ततो भवः ।

अतः स्वयंभुवश्चान्ये मरीच्याद्यार्कसंभवाः ॥" (अ० २५, श्लो० ६)

इत्याभ्यां वचनाभ्यां प्रतिपादिता ब्रह्मणो रुद्रादिसृष्टिः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते। तत्र "परो नारायणो देवः" इति वचनं स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "कस्योदरे" इति श्लोकव्याख्यायां समुद्धृतमवलोक्यते। "आद्यो नारायणो देवः" इति वचनं रहस्यत्रयसारे परदेवतापारमार्थ्याधिकारे उद्धृतं संलक्ष्यते॥

(४) श्रीवाराहे सप्ततितमेऽध्यायेऽगस्त्यरुद्रसंवादस्थैः

"क एषां भवतां याज्यो वरिष्ठश्च नृपोत्तम।
एवमुक्ते तदोवाच रुद्रो मां सुरसन्निधौ॥ ११॥

रुद्र उवाच—

शृण्वन्तु विबुधाः सर्वे तथा देवर्षयोऽमलाः।
ब्रह्मर्षयश्च विख्याताः सर्वे शृण्वन्तु मे वचः॥
त्वं चागस्त्य महाबुद्धे शृणु मे गदतो वचः॥ १२॥

यो यज्ञैरिज्यते देवो यस्मात्सर्वमिदं जगत्।
उत्पन्नं सर्वदा यस्मिन् लीनं भवति सामरम्।
नारायणः परो देवः सर्वरूपो जनार्दनः॥ १३, १४॥

त्रिधाऽऽत्मानं स भगवान् ससर्ज परमेश्वरः।
रजस्तमोभ्यां युक्तोऽभूद्रजस्सत्त्वाधिकं विभुः॥ १५॥

ससर्ज नाभिकमलाद् ब्रह्माणं कमलासनम्।
रजसा तमसा युक्तः सोऽपि मामसृजद्विभुः॥ १६॥

यत् सत्त्वं स हरिर्देवो यो हरिस्तत् परं पदम्।
ये सत्त्वरजसी सोऽपि ब्रह्मा कमलसंभवः॥ १७॥

यो ब्रह्मा सैव देवस्तु यो देवः स चतुर्मुखः।
यद्रजस्तमसोपेतं सोऽहं नास्त्यत्र संशयः॥ १८॥

सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चैव त्रितयं चैतदुच्यते।
सत्त्वेन मुच्यते जन्तुः सत्त्वं नारायणात्मकम्॥ १९॥

रजसा सत्त्वयुक्तेन भवेत्सृष्टी रजोऽधिका।
तच्च पैतामहं स्थानं सर्वशास्त्रेषु पठ्यते॥ २०॥

यद् वेदबाह्यं कर्म स्याच्छास्त्रमुद्दिश्य सेव्यते ।
तद्रौद्रमिति विख्यातं तन्नेष्टं गदितं नृणाम् ॥ २१ ॥
यद्वा न रजसा कर्म केवलं तामसं तु यत् ।
तद्दुर्गतिपरं नृणामिहलोके परत्र च ॥ २२ ॥
सत्त्वेन मुच्यते जन्तुः सत्त्वं नारायणात्मकम् ॥ २३ ॥

इत्येभिर्वचनैः प्रतिपाद्यमानं ब्रह्मविष्णुरुद्राणां राजससात्त्विकतामसत्वं नारायणस्य सर्वदेवश्रेष्ठत्वं नारायणोपासनस्यैव मोक्षहेतुत्वं ब्रह्मरुद्रोपासनस्य सांसारिक-फलपर्यवसायित्वं च श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायेऽभ्युपगम्यते । श्रीवराहपुराणस्थेष्वेषु वचनेषु बहूनि वचनानि श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेष्वीषत्पाठभेदेन समुद्धृतानि दृश्यन्ते । तथाहि—स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "कः श्रीः श्रियः" इति पद्यव्याख्यायां पुराणे च वाराहे अगस्त्यरुद्रसंवादे रुद्रः —

यत् सत्त्वं स हरिर्देवो यो हरिस्तत् परं पदम् ।
सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चेति त्रितयं चैतदुच्यते ॥
सत्त्वेन मुच्यते जन्तुः सत्त्वं नारायणात्मकम् ।
रजसा सत्त्वयुक्तेन भवेच्छ्रीमान्यशोऽधिकः ।
तच्च पैतामहं स्थानं सर्वशास्त्रेषु पठ्यते ॥
यद्वेदबाह्यं कर्म स्यान्मामुद्दिश्योपसेव्यते ।
तद्रौद्रमिति विख्यातं कनिष्ठगतिदं नृणाम् ॥
यद्धीनतपसा युक्तं केवलं तामसं तु तत् ।
तद्दुर्गतिप्रदं नृणामिहलोके परत्र च ॥

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ "यत् सत्त्वम्" इत्यादीनि वचनानि समुद्धृतानि । तथेमानि वचनानि पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायामप्युद्धृतानि । एवं स्तोत्रभाष्ये "कस्योदरे" इति पद्यव्याख्यायां "श्रीवाराहे चागस्त्यं प्रति रुद्रः —

नारायणः परो देवः सत्त्वरूपी जनार्दनः ।
त्रिधात्मानं स भगवान् ससर्ज परमेश्वरः ॥
रजस्तमोभ्यां युक्तोऽभूद्रजस्सत्त्वाधिकं विभुम् ।
ससर्ज नाभीकमले ब्रह्माणं कमलासनम् ॥
रजसा तमसायुक्तं सोऽपि मामसृजत्प्रभुः ॥" इति ।

अत्र त्रिधाऽऽत्मानमित्येतत् स्वेन रूपेण क्षेत्रज्ञद्वयविशिष्टरूपेण चेति बहु-प्रमाणानुसारेण मन्तव्यम्। रजस्तमोयोगश्च तद्गुणकद्रव्याधिष्ठातृत्वेन भवति ॥ इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ "नारायणः परो देवः"[1] इत्यादीनि वचनानि उद्धृतानि। अत्रेद-मवधेयम्, अत्र स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "त्रिधात्मानम्" इत्यस्य क्लिष्टगत्या निर्वहणाद्विज्ञायते श्रीवाराहे तथाविधा अप्यर्थाः प्रतिपाद्यन्ते ये श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायस्य प्रतिकूला इति ॥

(५) श्रीवाराहे दशमेऽध्याये—

"चन्द्रादित्यौ वसवो ये च साध्या विश्वेश्विनौ मरुतश्चोष्मपाश्च।
सर्वे भवन्तं शरणं गताः स्म कुरुष्व पूज्यानिह विश्वमूर्ते" ॥ ७ ॥

इति देवप्रार्थितेन नारायणेन तेषां यागादावाराध्यत्वं वरत्वेन वितीर्णमित्यर्थो रामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते। अयं श्लोकः स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "कस्योदरे" इति पद्यव्याख्यायामुद्धृतः। "स्मः" इति तत्र पाठः।

(६) श्रीवाराहे त्रयस्सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"चतुर्मुखो वा यदि कोटिवक्त्रो भवेन्नरः कोऽपि विशुद्धचेताः।
स मे गुणानामयुतैरनेकैर्वदेत् तदा देववर प्रसीद ॥" ३४ ॥

इत्यादिभिर्वचनैः प्रतिपाद्यमानं श्रीविष्णोरनन्तकल्याणगुणपूर्णत्वं श्रीरामानुज-संप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते। अयं श्लोकः स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "यद्वाश्रमावधि" इति श्लोक-व्याख्यायां वाराहे च रुद्रगीतासु सप्तमाध्याये—

"चतुर्मुखायुर्यदि कोटिवक्त्रो भवेन्नरः क्वापि विशुद्धचेताः।
स ते गुणानामयुतैकमंशं वदेन्न वा देववर प्रसीद ॥" इति
इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ समीचीनपाठभेदेन सहोद्धृतं लक्ष्यते।

(७) श्रीवराहपुराणे पञ्चमेऽध्याये—

"बृहस्पते कर्मिणा किं प्राप्यते ज्ञानिनाऽथवा।
मोक्ष एतं ममाचक्ष्व पृच्छतः संशयं प्रभो" ॥ १६ ॥

इति रैभ्यपृष्टस्य बृहस्पतेर्व्याधविप्रसंवादप्रसङ्गेन प्रवृत्तेः—

"यत् किंचित्कुरुते कर्म पुरुषः साध्वसाधु वा।
सर्वं नारायणे न्यस्य कुर्वन्नपि न लिप्यते ॥ १७ ॥

परमात्मा स्वयंभूतैः क्रीडते भगवान् स्वयम् ॥ २३ ॥

अहंभावः सदा ब्रह्मन्नविधेयो मुमुक्षुभिः ।२४।

एवं ज्ञानं भवेत्कर्म कुर्वतोऽपि स्वजातिकम् ।
भवेन्मुक्तिर्द्विजश्रेष्ठ रैभ्य राजवसो ध्रुवम्" ॥४३॥

इत्येभिः कर्मज्ञानपरैर्वचनैः श्रीवराहपुराणे चतुर्थेऽध्याये "कथमाराधयेद्देवं हरिं नारायणं परम्" ।१७। इति राज्ञाऽश्वशिरसा पृष्टाभ्यां जैगीषव्यकपिलाभ्यामुत्तरत्वेनोक्तैः—

"किंतु सर्वशरीरस्थः परमात्मा जगत्पतिः ।
स्वदेहे दृश्यते भक्त्या नैकस्थानगतस्तु सः ॥३७॥

एवं सर्वगतो विष्णुस्तव देहे जनेश्वर ।
मन्त्रिणां भृत्यसंघस्य सुराद्या ये प्रदर्शिताः ॥३९॥

पशवः कीटसंघाश्च तेऽपि विष्णुमया नृप ।
भावनां तु दृढां कुर्याद्यतः सर्वमयो हरिः ॥४०॥

नान्यत् तत्सदृशं भूतमितिभावेन सेव्यताम् ।
एष ते ज्ञानसद्भावस्तव राजन् प्रकीर्तितः ॥४१॥

परिपूर्णेन भावेन स्मर नारायणं गुरुम् ।
पूजोपहारैर्धूपैश्च ब्राह्मणानां च तर्पणैः ॥

ध्यानेन सुस्थितेनाशु सुप्राप्यः परमेश्वरः ॥४२॥

इत्येभिर्वचनैः, सप्तत्रिंशेऽध्याये—

"भावसाध्योऽस्म्यहं देवि न वित्तैर्न जपैरहम्" ॥२॥ इति,

पञ्चदशाधिकशततमेऽध्याये—

"नाहं दानसहस्रेण नाहं यज्ञशतैरपि ।
तुष्यामि न तु वित्तेन ये नराः स्वल्पचेतसः ॥ ३ ॥

एकचित्तं समाधाय यो मां जानाति माधवि ।
नित्यं तुष्यामि तस्याहं पुरुषं बहुदोषकम्" ॥ ४ ॥ इति,

द्वाचत्वारिंशदधिकशततमेऽध्याये —

"तस्माच्चित्तं समादाय मां प्रपद्यस्व मेदिनि ।
न्यस्य ज्ञानं च योगं च एकचित्ता भजस्व माम् ॥२७॥

मच्चित्तः सततं यो मां भजेत नियतव्रतः ।
मत्पार्श्वं प्राप्य परमं मद्भावायोपपद्यते" ॥२८॥

इति भगवतो वराहस्य वचनैश्च प्रतिपाद्यमानः कर्मज्ञानभक्तीनां मोक्षसाधनत्व-प्रकारो गीताभाष्यं रचयद्भिस्तदारंभे "ज्ञानकर्मानुगृहीतं भक्तियोगमवतारयामास" इति भाषमाणैः श्रीरामानुजाचार्यैरुररीक्रियत इति गीताभाष्यपरिशीलिनां सुगमम् ॥ एवं सृष्टि-प्रकारो भुवनकोशप्रकारः श्राद्धमहिमा श्राद्धानुष्ठानप्रक्रिया श्राद्धवर्ज्यानि प्रथमादि-तिथिषु तत्तद्देवताराधनप्रकारः प्रतिद्वादशि विष्णुपूजनप्रक्रिया, विविधा दानधर्माः वर्णाश्रमधर्माः नानाधातुभिर्भगवत्प्रतिमानिर्माणपूर्वकं तत्प्रतिष्ठापनाराधनयोः प्रकाराः पाञ्चरात्रतन्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं प्रतिष्ठाराधनादौ संग्राह्यता पाशुपतागमस्याप्रामाण्यमग्राह्यता नानातीर्थमहिमा ब्राह्मरौद्रवैष्णवशक्तिमहिमा नरकयातनानुभवप्रकारस्तत्तद्धर्मनिष्ठ-विविधमहापुरुषचरितानीत्यादयस्ते ते वराहपुराणवर्णिता अर्थाः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये-ऽङ्गीक्रियन्ते इत्यलं विस्तरेण ।

(९) रहस्यत्रयसारेऽर्थपञ्चकाधिकारे भगवद्विग्रहस्याप्राकृतत्वप्रतिपादना-वसरे समुद्धृतं "न तस्य प्राकृता मूर्तिर्मांसमेदोऽस्थिसंभवा ।" इति वचनं श्रीवराहपुराणे पञ्चसप्ततितमेऽध्याये एकचत्वारिंशश्लोकार्धत्वेन दृश्यते ।

(१०) रहस्यत्रयसारपुरुषार्थकाष्ठाधिकारे समुद्धृतं—

"तस्य यज्ञवराहस्य विष्णोरमिततेजसः ।
प्रणामं येऽपि कुर्वन्ति तेषामपि नमोनमः ॥"

इति वचनं श्रीवराहपुराणे एकादशाधिकद्विशततमेऽध्याये

"तस्य यज्ञवराहस्य विष्णोरमिततेजसः ।
प्रणामं ये च कुर्वन्ति ते पूज्याः सततं सुरैः ॥८३॥

इत्येवमीषत्पाठभेदेनोपलभ्यते ।

(११) रहस्यत्रयसारे साध्योपासनशोधनाधिकारे "नमो नारायणेत्युक्त्वा श्वपाकः पुनरागमत्" इति सामि समुद्धृतं व्याख्यातृभिः—

"ततः प्रभाते विमले विनिवृत्ते च जागरे ।
नमो नारायणेत्युक्त्वा श्वपाकः पुनरागमत् ॥"

इति कात्स्न्येंनोदाहृतं श्रीवाराहवचनं श्रीवराहपुराणे १३९ तमेऽध्याये

"अथ प्रभाते विमले गीते नृत्ये च जागरे ।
नमोनारायणायेति श्वपाकः परिवर्तते" ॥५३॥

इत्येवं पाठभेदेन संलक्ष्यते ।

(१२) श्रीवराहपुराणे द्वाविंशत्यधिकशततमेऽध्याये विद्यमानम्—

"अहं शिष्या च दासी च भक्त्या च त्वयि माधव ॥११॥

इत्येतद्धरणीवाक्यं श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकविरचिते रहस्यशिखामणौ समुद्धृतं प्रेक्ष्यते ।

(१३) श्रीवराहपुराणे सप्ततितमेऽध्याये वर्तमानं

"त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।
अल्पायासं दर्शयित्वा मोहयाशु महेश्वर" ॥३६॥

इतीदं वचनं श्रीरहस्यत्रयसारे परदेवतापारमार्थ्याधिकारे

"त्वं हि रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।
दर्शयित्वाल्पमायासं फलं शीघ्रं प्रदर्शय ॥"

इति पाठभेदेनोद्धृतं संदृश्यते ॥

(१४) श्रीभाष्यश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां पशुपत्यधिकरणे "तथाह्यष्टषष्टितमेऽध्याये-

"पौरुषं सूक्तमास्थाय ये यजन्ति द्विजास्तु माम् ।
संहिताजपमास्थाय ये मां प्राप्स्यन्ति ब्राह्मणाः ॥
अलाभे वेदमन्त्राणां पञ्चरात्रोदितेन हि ।
मार्गेण मां प्रपद्यन्ते ते मां प्राप्स्यन्ति मानवाः ॥
ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां पञ्चरात्रं विधीयते ।
शूद्रादीनां न तत् स्तोत्रपदवीमुपयास्यति ॥

एवं मयोक्तं विप्रेन्द्र पुराकल्पे पुरातनम् ।
पञ्चरात्रं सहस्राणां यदि कश्चिद्ग्रहीष्यति ॥
कर्मक्षये च मां कश्चिद्यदि भक्तो भजिष्यति ।
तस्य वेदाः पञ्चरात्रं नित्यं हृदि वसिष्यति ॥
वेदेन पञ्चरात्रेण भक्त्या यज्ञेन च द्विजाः ।
प्राप्योऽहं नान्यथा प्राप्यो वर्षलक्षैरपि द्विजाः ॥"

इति पञ्चरात्रस्य वेदतुल्यविकल्पभाजत्वानुगुणं प्रामाण्यमभिहितम् । तथा पाशुपतनिष्ठानां तन्त्रान्तरनिष्ठानामिव भगवच्छास्त्रपराङ्मुखत्वं तामसयुगानुवर्तित्वं च तत्रोक्तम्—

"इतरे राजसैर्भावैस्तामसैश्च समावृताः ।
भविष्यन्ति द्विजश्रेष्ठ मच्छासनपराङ्मुखाः ॥
कृतं त्रेताद्वापरं च युगानि त्रीणि नारद ।
सत्त्वस्था मां समेष्यन्ति कलौ रजस्तमोऽधिकाः ॥"

इत्याद्यासु पंक्तिषु समुद्धृतानि वचनाचि श्रीवराहपुराणे षट्षष्टितमेऽध्याये

"पौरुषं सूक्तमास्थाय ये यजन्ति द्विजास्तु माम् ।
ते मां प्राप्स्यन्ति सततं संहिताध्ययनेन च ॥१०॥
अलाभे वेदमन्त्राणां पञ्चरात्रोदितेन हि ।
मार्गेण मां यजन्ते ये ते मां प्राप्स्यन्ति मानवाः ॥११॥
ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां पञ्चरात्रं विधीयते ।
शूद्रादीनां तु मे क्षेत्रपदवीगमनं द्विज ॥
मन्नाम विहितं तेषां नान्यपूजादिकं चरेत् ॥१२॥
एवं मयोक्तं विप्रेन्द्र पुराकल्पे पुरातनम् ।
पञ्चरात्रं सहस्राणां यदि कश्चिद्ग्रहीष्यति ॥१३॥
कर्मक्षये च मां कश्चिद् यदि भक्तो भविष्यति ।
तस्य चेदं पञ्चरात्रं नित्यं हृदि वसिष्यति ॥१४॥
इतरे राजसैर्भावैस्तामसैश्च समावृताः ।
भविष्यन्ति द्विजश्रेष्ठ मय्यासनपराङ्मुखाः ॥१५॥

कृतं त्रेता द्वापरं च युगानि त्रीणि नारद ।
सत्त्वस्था मां समेष्यन्ति कलौ रजस्तमोऽधिकाः ॥१६॥
अन्यञ्च ते वरं दद्मि शृणु नारद सांप्रतम् ।
यदिदं पञ्चरात्रं मे शास्त्रं परमदुर्लभम् ॥
तद्भवान् वेत्स्यते सर्वं मत्प्रसादान्न संशयः ॥१७॥
वेदेन पञ्चरात्रेण भक्त्या यज्ञेन च द्विज ।
प्राप्योऽहं नान्यया वत्स वर्षकोट्ययुतैरपि" ॥१८॥

इत्येवं पाठभेदेनोपलभ्यन्ते ॥

(१५) श्रीभाष्यपाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां "किं च तत्र रुद्रवचः—

देवदेव जनःसर्वो मुक्तिमार्गव्यवस्थितः ।
कथं सृष्टिः प्रभविता नरकेषु च को वसेत् ॥
एवमुक्तस्तदा देवैर्मामुवाच जनार्दनः ।
युगानि त्रीणि सहसा मामुपेष्यन्ति मानवाः ॥
अन्त्ये युगे प्रविरला भविष्यन्ति मदाश्रयाः ॥
एष मोहं सृजाम्याशु यो जनं मोहयिष्यति ।
त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ॥
अल्पायासं दर्शयित्वा फलं शीघ्रं प्रदर्शय ।
कुहकानीन्द्रजालानि विरुद्धाचरणानि च ॥
दर्शयित्वा जनं सर्वं मोहयाशु महेश्वर ।
एवमुक्तस्तदा तेन देवेन परमेष्ठिना ॥
आत्मा तु गोपितः सद्यः प्रकाशोऽहं कृतस्ततः ॥
तस्मादारभ्य कालात्तु मत्प्रणीतेषु सत्तम ।
शास्त्रेष्वभिरतो लोको बाहुल्येन न वेद तम्" ॥

इत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये वराहपुराणस्थत्वेनोद्धृतानि वचनानि श्रीवराहपुराणे सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"देवदेव जनः सर्वो मुक्तिमार्गे व्यवस्थितः ।
कथं सृष्टिश्च भविता नरकेषु च को वसेत् ॥२२॥

एवमुक्तस्ततो देवो मामुवाच जनार्दनः ।
युगानि त्रीणि बहवो मामुपेष्यन्ति मानवाः ॥३४॥
अन्त्ये युगे प्रविरला भविष्यन्ति मदाश्रयाः ।
एष मोहं सृजाम्याशु यो जनं मोहयिष्यति ॥३५॥
त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।
अल्पायासं दर्शयित्वा मोहयाशु महेश्वर ॥३६॥
एवमुक्तस्तदा तेन देवेन परमेष्ठिना ।
आत्मा तु गोपितस्सद्यः प्रकाशोऽहंकृतस्तदा ॥३७॥
तस्मादारभ्य कालात्तु मत्प्रणीतेषु सत्तम ।
शास्त्रेष्वभिरतो लोको बाहुल्येन भवेदतः ॥३८॥"

इत्येवमुपलभ्यन्ते ॥

(१६) पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां—"यथाद्विसप्ततितमे
"मां विष्णोर्व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्माणं च द्विजोत्तमाः ।
यजन्ति पापकर्माणस्ते यान्ति नरकं नराः ॥
ये वादमार्गनिर्मुक्तास्तेषां मोहार्थमेव च ।
नयसिद्धान्तसंज्ञं हि मया शास्त्रं तु दर्शितम् ॥
पाशोऽयं पशुभावस्तु स यदा पतितो भवेत् ।
तदा पाशुपतं शास्त्रं जायते वेदसंज्ञितम्" ॥ इति"

इत्येवं वराहपुराणस्थत्वेन वर्णितानि वचनानि वराहपुराणे सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"मां विष्णो र्व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्माणं च द्विजोत्तम ।
भजन्ते पापकर्माणस्ते यान्ति नरकं नराः ॥४०॥
ये वादमार्गनिर्मुक्तास्तेषां मोहार्थमेव च ।
नयसिद्धान्तसंज्ञाभिर्मया शास्त्रं तु दर्शितम् ॥४१॥
पाशोयं पशुभावस्तु स यदा पतितो भवेत ।
तदा पाशुपतं शास्त्रं जायते वेदसंज्ञितम्" ॥४२॥

इत्येवं समुपलभ्यन्ते ॥

(१७) तस्यामेव पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां—"यथा त्रिसप्ततितमे

"मोहनार्थं तु भूतानां त्वया शास्त्रं पृथक् कृतम् ।
तत् कदा हेतुना केन कृतं देव वदस्व नः" ॥

इत्युदाहृतं वचनं वराहपुराणे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये नवमश्लोकत्वेन दृश्यते ॥

(१८) तस्यामेव श्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तदनन्तरं "दुर्भिक्षाद् गौतमेन रक्षितैरननुमतैर्निर्गमिषुभिर्मुनिभिर्गौतमातिसंधानमुक्त्वाऽभिहितम्—

"एवमुक्तस्तदा तैस्तु गौतमः किमिदं त्विति ।
गोवध्याकारणं मुह्यंस्तावत्पश्यति योगवित् ॥
ऋषीणां मायया सर्वमिदं जातं विचिन्त्य वै ।
शशाप ताँस्तदा भस्ममिथ्याभूतपराँस्तथा ॥
भविष्यथ त्रयीबाह्या वेदकर्मबहिष्कृताः ।
तच्छ्रुत्वा क्रूरवचनं गौतमस्य महामुनेः ॥
ऊचुः सप्तर्षयो मैवं सर्वकालं द्विजोत्तमाः ।
भवन्तु किं तु ते वाक्यममोघं नात्र संशयः ॥
त्वद्वाक्यवह्निनिर्दग्धाः सदा कलियुगे द्विजाः ।
भविष्यन्ति क्रियाहीनास्सर्ववेदवहिष्कृताः ॥"

इति गौतमशापं तल्लघूकरणाय कलौ जन्म तदनुग्रहाय तद्गोत्रप्रवर्तकैर्महेश्वरस्याभ्यर्थनं चोक्त्वा" इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोद्धृतानीमानि वचनानि श्रीवराहपुराणे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"एवमुक्तस्तदा तैस्तु गौतमः किमिदं त्विति ।
गोवध्याकारणं मुह्यं तावत् पश्यति गौतमः ॥३८॥
ऋषीणां मायया सर्वमिदं जातं विचिन्त्य वै ।
शशाप तान् जटाभस्ममिथ्याव्रतधराँस्तथा ।
भविष्यथ त्रयीबाह्यावेदमार्गबहिष्कृताः ॥३९॥

तच्छ्रुत्वा क्रूरवचनं गौतमस्य महामुनेः ।
ऊचुः सप्तर्षयो मैवं सर्वकालं द्विजोत्तम ॥४०॥

एवं तु किंतु ते वाक्यं मोघं नास्त्यत्र संशयः ।
यदि नाम कलौ सर्वे भविष्यन्ति द्विजोत्तमाः ॥४१॥

उपकारिणि एते हि अपकर्तार एव तु ।
इत्थं भूता अपि कलौ भक्तिभाजो भवन्तु ते ॥४२॥

त्वद्वाक्यवह्निनिर्दग्धाः सदा कलियुगे द्विजाः ।
भविष्यन्ति क्रियाहीना वेदमार्गबहिष्कृताः ॥४३॥

इत्येवं संदृश्यन्ते ।

(१९) पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तत्र यथा महेश्वरवचः—

"एवमभ्यर्थितस्तैस्तु पुराऽहं द्विजसत्तम ।
वेदक्रियासमायुक्तां कृतवानस्मि संहिताम् ॥

निश्वासाख्यां ततस्तस्यां लीना बाभ्रव्यशाण्डिलाः ।
अल्पापराधा इत्येव शेषा बैडालिकाभवन् ॥
मयैव मोहितास्ते हि भविष्यज्ज्ञानता द्विजाः ॥" इति तत्र—

"निश्वाससंहितायां हि लक्षमात्रा प्रमाणतः ।
सैव पाशुपती दीक्षा योगः पाशुपतश्च सः ॥

एतस्माद्वेदमार्गाद्धि यदन्यदिह जायते ।
तच्छूद्रकर्म विज्ञेयं रौद्रं शौचविगर्हितम् ॥

ये रुद्रमुपजीवन्ति कलौ बैडालिका नराः ।
उच्छिष्टरुद्रास्ते ज्ञेया नाहं तेषु व्यवस्थितः ॥"

इति, तथा "तेषां गौतमशापाद्धि भविष्यन्त्यन्वये द्विजाः" इति प्रक्रम्य

"तेषां मध्ये सदाचारा ये ते मच्छासने रताः ।
ते स्वर्गमपवर्गं च यान्त्येव खलु निश्चयः ॥

बैडालिका ये यास्यन्ति मम सन्ततिदूषकाः ।
प्राग्गौतमाग्निनिर्दग्धाः पुनर्मद्वचनाद् द्विजाः ॥
नरकं ते गमिष्यन्ति नात्र कार्या विचारणा ॥"

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तावुद्धृतानि वचनानि वराहपुराणे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"एवमभ्यर्थितस्तैस्तु पुराहं द्विजसत्तम ।
वेदक्रियासमायुक्तां कृतवानस्मि संहिताम् ॥५०॥

निश्वासाख्यां ततस्तस्यां लीना बाभ्रव्यशाण्डिलाः ।
अल्पापराधं श्रुत्वैव गतास्ते दाम्भिका भवन् ॥५१॥

मयैव मोहितास्ते तु भविष्यज्ज्ञानता द्विजाः ।
लौल्यार्थिनः स्वशास्त्राणि करिष्यन्ति कलौ नराः ॥५२॥

निश्वाससंहितायां हि लक्षमात्रं प्रमाणतः ।
सैव पाशुपती दीक्षा योगः पशुपतेस्तथा ॥५३॥

एतस्माद्वेदमार्गाद्धि यदन्यदिह जायते ।
तत् क्षुद्रकर्म विज्ञेयं रौद्रं शौचविवर्जितम् ॥५४॥

ये रुद्रमुपजीवन्ति कलौ वैदान्तिका नराः ।
लौल्यार्थिनः स्वशास्त्राणि करिष्यन्ति कलौ नराः ॥
उच्छुष्मरुद्रास्ते ज्ञेया नाहं तेषु व्यवस्थितः ॥५५॥ इति,
"तेषां गौतमशापाद्धि भविष्यन्त्यन्वये द्विजाः" ॥५८॥ इति,
"तेषां मच्छासनरताः सदाचाराश्चये द्विजाः ।
स्वर्गं चैवापवर्गं च इत्युक्त्वा संशयात् पुरा ।
वेदान्तिकाऽधो यास्यन्ति मम सन्ततिदूषकाः ॥५९॥

प्राग् गौतमाग्निना दग्धा पुनर्मद्वचनाद् द्विजाः ।
नरकं तु गमिष्यन्ति नात्र कार्या विचारणा ॥६०॥"

इत्येवमीषत्पाठभेदेन संलक्ष्यन्ते ।

(२०) पाञ्चरात्ररक्षायाम् "अत्र चाकर्मण्यताहेतूनपराधानेवमाह भगवान्—"शृणु सुन्दरि तत्त्वेन आहारस्य विनिर्णयम्" इत्यारभ्योपात्ता श्लोकानां सप्तत्रिंशत्

वराहपुराणे सप्तदशाधिकशततमेऽध्याये ईषत् पाठभेदेनोपलभ्यन्ते ॥ इत्थं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषु तत्र तत्र प्रमाणत्वेनोद्धृतानि वचनानि सांप्रतमुपलभ्यमाने कलिकातानगरमुद्रिते वराहपुराणे आकरनिर्देशपूर्वकमुदाहृतानि ।

अथ श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषु तत्र तत्र वराहपुराणीयत्वेन प्रमाणत्वेनोद्धृतानि यानि वचनानि सांप्रतिके वराहपुराणे नोपलभ्यन्ते, तान्युदाह्रियन्ते ।

(१) पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तत्राष्टषष्टितमे—

"विष्णुरूपेण याज्योऽहं सर्वदेवैर्द्विजोत्तम ।
सात्त्विकी सा समाख्याता वृत्तिर्मे मुनिपुंगव ॥
जटामकुटधारी च नागभूतैः समावृतः ।
सिद्धान्तनयमार्गस्थैरहं रुद्रेति पूजितः ।
राजसीं मे तु तां वृत्तिं जानीहि द्विजसत्तम ॥"

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोदाहृतानि वचनानि सांप्रतिके वराहपुराणे कुत्रापि नोपलभ्यन्ते ।

(२) तत्रैव श्रुतप्रकाशिकायां समनन्तरमुद्धृतं—

"तथार्हद्बुद्धभिक्षूणां बैडालव्रतिकैरहम् ।
तमोऽतिरिक्तैर्यष्टव्यस्तांस्तमस्येव पातये ॥"

इति समुद्धृतं वराहपुराणवचनमपि अस्मिन् वराहपुराणे न लक्ष्यते ।

(३) श्रीकृष्णपादस्वामिभिः स्वीयरहस्यग्रन्थे श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकै रहस्यशिखामणिनाम्नि रहस्यग्रन्थे च श्रीवराहपुराणचरमश्लोकत्वेनोद्धृत्य व्याख्यातौ अन्यान्यरहस्यग्रन्थेषु बहुश उद्धृतप्रतीकौ—

"स्थिते मनसि सुस्वस्थे शरीरे सति यो नरः ।
धातुसाम्ये स्थिते स्मर्ता विश्वरूपं च मामजम् ॥
ततस्तं म्रियमाणं तु काष्ठपाषाणसन्निभम् ।
अहं स्मरामि मद्भक्तं नयामि परमां गतिम् ॥"

इत्येतौ श्लोकौ कलिकातामुद्रितेऽस्मिन् वराहपुराणे न दृष्टिगोचरीभवतः ।

(४) श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकैर्विरचितायां सच्चरित्ररक्षायां प्रथमेऽधिकारे श्रीवराहे—

"वासुदेवाङ्कनं कुर्यादात्मनो बाहुमूलयोः ।
सोऽश्वमेधफलं प्राप्य विष्णुलोके महीयते ॥ इति,

तत्रैव क्षेत्रमाहात्म्ये—

"मच्चक्राङ्कितदेहो यो मद्भक्तो भुवि दुर्लभ ।
मामेवैष्यति धर्मात्मा मदेकान्तेन चेतसा ॥
चक्राङ्कितभुजाः केचिद्यत्र कुत्र वसन्ति वै ।
योजनानि तथा त्रीणि मम क्षेत्रं वसुन्धरे ॥
ये केचिद्यत्र पुरुषा विष्णुचक्राङ्कमुद्रिताः ।
तेषां दर्शनमात्रेण महापातकनाशनम् ॥
भूतप्रेतपिशाचाश्च डाकिन्यश्च वसुन्धरे ।
तत् सर्वं प्रशमं याति यत्र चक्राङ्कितो वसेत्" ॥

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणस्थत्वेनोद्धृताः श्लोका अस्मिन् वराहपुराणपुस्तके कुत्रापि न दृश्यन्ते ।

(५) सच्चरित्ररक्षायां द्वितीयेऽधिकारे तत्रैव क्षेत्रमाहात्म्याभिधानभागे—

"कुलीनो ब्राह्मणो विद्वान् भस्मधारी भवेद्यदि ।
वर्जयेत्तादृशं देवि मद्योच्छिष्टघटं यथा ॥"

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोद्धृतः श्लोकोऽस्मिन्वराहपुराणे न दृश्यते ।

(६) सच्चरित्ररक्षायां द्वितीयाधिकारे सन्ति च पुराणादिष्वपि तथात्वे वचांसि । तथाहि श्रीवाराहे—

"एकान्तिनो महाभागा मत्स्वरूपविदोऽमलाः ।
सान्तरालान् प्रकुर्वीरन् पुण्ड्रान् मम पदाकृतीन् ॥
रक्षार्थं मङ्गलार्थं च पवित्रार्थं वरानने ।
मन्त्रमुच्चार्य विधिवद्धारयेदूर्ध्वपुण्ड्रकान्" ॥

इत्यत्रोद्धृतौ श्लोकौ वराहपुराणे न लक्ष्येते ।

(७) श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकविरचितायां पाञ्चरात्ररक्षायां तृतीयेऽधिकारे "भगवन्मन्दिरे च तत्तच्छास्त्रोक्तानपचारान् परिहरेत् । एवं तु श्रीवराहपुराणे द्वात्रिंशदपचाराः पठिताः" इत्युक्त्वा धरणीवराहसंवादरूपं चतुश्चत्वारिंशच्छ्लोकात्मकमेकमध्यायं विलिख्य "इति श्रीवराहपुराणे धरणीप्रश्ने द्वात्रिंशदपचारो नाम पञ्चचत्वारिंशोऽध्यायः" इत्युल्लिख्योपसंहृतम् । परंत्वयमध्यायो वराहपुराणे पूर्वोत्तरभागयोः कुत्रापि नोपलभ्यते किं तु वराहपुराणे ऊनाशीत्यधिकशततमेऽध्यायेऽष्टभिः श्लोकैरन्यथैव त्रयस्त्रिंशदपचाराः पठिताः संलक्ष्यन्ते ।

(८) तत्रैव पाञ्चरात्ररक्षायां समनन्तरमुद्धृतं रहस्यत्रयसारे प्रभावव्यवस्थाधिकारे चोद्धृतं—

प्रमादादपि कीलालं यः स्पृशेद्वैष्णवो नरः ।
उपचारशतेनापि न क्षमामि वसुन्धरे ॥"

इति वचनं कलिकातानगरमुद्रिते वराहपुराणे कुत्रापि नोपलभ्यते ।

(९) स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "जनित्वाऽहं वंशे" इति श्लोकव्याख्याने—

"लब्ध्वा तु मानुषं देहं पञ्चभूतसमन्वितम् ।
मामेव न प्रपद्यन्ते ततो दुःखतरं नु किम् ॥"

इति वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोद्धृतः श्लोको वराहपुराणे नोपलभ्यते । अनेन श्लोकेन वराहपुराणे षोडशाधिकशततमेऽध्याये भाव्यं तत्र तथाविधश्लोकानां बहूनां दर्शनात् । परंतु तत्रायं नोपलभ्यते । इत्थमन्वेषणे कृते श्रीवराहपुराणीयत्वेन श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषूद्धृतानि सांप्रतं कलिकातानगरमुद्रिते वराहपुराणेऽनुपलभ्यमानानि बहूनि वचनान्युदाहर्तुं शक्यन्ते । परंतु अत्र विस्तरभयाद्विरम्यते ।

अत्रायं प्रश्न उन्मिषति एषमनुपलम्भस्य को हेतुः ? अत्रोत्तरमुक्तपूर्वं यत् कलिकातानगरे हृषीकेशशास्त्रिणा संशोध्य संपादितमिदं वराहपुराणमुत्तरदेशीयानां त्रयाणां लिखितग्रन्थानां सहायेनैव मुद्रितम् , न तु दक्षिणदेशीयानां ग्रन्थानामवलम्बनेन । दाक्षिणात्यवराहपुराणग्रन्थे एषां श्लोकानां पाठः संभाव्यते । किं च,

अन्यान्यपुराणेषु चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रसंख्याकग्रन्थमितत्वेन वराहपुराणे वर्ण्यमाने सांप्रतिकमुपलभ्यमानस्य द्वादशसहस्रग्रन्थमितस्य वराहपुराणस्य दर्शनेन अवशिष्ट दशसहस्रग्रन्थलोपोऽनुमीयते। यदि विभिन्नदेशेषूपलभ्यमानान् लिखितवराहपुराण-ग्रन्थानवलम्ब्य सर्वपरामर्शपूर्वकं यदि वराहपुराणं संशोध्येत प्रकाश्येत, तर्हि बहूनामध्यायानामाधिक्यं ध्रुवं फलेदित्यत्र न सन्देहः ॥

अथ विमृश्यते श्रीवराहपुराणस्य रामानुजसंप्रदायाचार्यैरतिशयेनाद्रियमाणत्वे किं बीजम्? इति तत्रेदं परिस्फुरति यत्—

"वैष्णवं नारदीयं च तथा भागवतं शुभम्।
गारुडं च तथा पाद्मं वाराहं शुभदर्शने।
सात्त्विकानि पुराणानि विज्ञेयानि शुभानि वै॥"

इति पाद्मवचनानुरोधेन वाराहपुराणस्य विष्णुपुराणवत् सात्त्विकत्वात् विष्णुपुराणापेक्षयातिशयेन वैष्णवधर्मप्रतिपादकत्वाच्च वाराहपुराणं श्रीवैष्णवाचार्यै राजसतामसपुराणापेक्षयाऽतिशयेनाद्रियत इति। वराहपुराणापेक्षया श्रीवैष्णव-संप्रदाये विष्णुपुराणस्यैवादरणं समधिकं दृश्यते, यतस्तत्पुराणवचनान्येव बहुश-उदाहृत्य श्रीभाष्यादिषु श्रीरामानुजाचार्यप्रभृतिभिः स्वमतस्थापनं क्रियते।

अथ विचार्यते श्रीवराहपुराणवचनानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिस्तत्र तत्र बहुश उदाहरणादिदं पुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिः प्राचीनैराचार्यैर्निर्मितं परिवर्धितं वेति शक्यशङ्कमुत नेति। तत्रेदं प्रतिभाति श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये द्विविधा ग्रन्थाः पूर्वाचार्यैर्निर्मिताः सन्ति रहस्यग्रन्थाः सदस्यग्रन्थाश्चेति। तत्र रहस्यग्रन्थाः शिष्याणामुपदेशार्थं निर्मिताः तेषु परवादिभिः प्रमाणग्रन्थत्वेनानभिमतानां श्रीरामा-नुजसंप्रदाये प्रमाणत्वेन स्वीकृतानां दिव्यसूरिगाथानामपि प्रमाणत्वेनोपन्यासो भवति। सदस्यग्रन्थेषु श्रीभाष्यादिषु संस्कृतभाषामयेषु ग्रन्थेषु परवादिसंप्रतिपन्नानि वचनान्येव प्रमाणत्वेनोदाह्रियन्त इति स्थितिः। सदस्यग्रन्थाः प्राधान्येन परवादि-प्रतिबोधनार्थं निर्मिताः। तेषूभयवादिसम्मतानां प्रमाणवचनानामेवोल्लेखो दृश्यते। तत्र परवादिप्रतिबोधनार्थं प्रणीतेषु श्रीभाष्यस्तोत्ररत्नभाष्यसच्चरित्ररक्षापाञ्चरात्ररक्षा-दिषु संस्कृतमयेषु सदस्यग्रन्थेषु पूर्वप्रदर्शितरीत्या वराहपुराणवचनानां बहूनां परवादिनः प्रतिप्रमाणत्वेनोदाहरणात्तेषां परवादिसंप्रतिपन्नसिद्धेर्वराहपुराणस्य तथा-

विधवचनशतघटितस्य श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायपूर्वाचार्यैः प्रणीतत्वं परिवर्धितत्वं वा न शक्यशङ्कम्। तथात्वे हि परवादिमतिरोधनप्रधानेषु ग्रन्थेषु परवादिविप्रतिपन्नानामेषां वचनानां प्रमाणत्वेनोदाहरणं न युज्यते। किं च श्रीवराहपुराणे श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानादृतानामपि बहूनामर्थानां वर्णनदर्शनात् अवसीयते इदं पुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिपूर्वाचार्यैर्न प्रणीतं परिवर्धितं वेति। यदि तेऽस्य ग्रन्थस्य प्रणेतारः परिवर्धयितारो वा स्युः, तर्हि स्वसंप्रदायामान्यानर्थान् नोपनिबध्नीरन्। दृश्यते च बहूनां रामानुजसंप्रदायामान्यानामर्थानामुपनिबन्धः। तथाहि—

(१) श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये विष्णोः सर्वेश्वरत्वं ब्रह्मरुद्रयोरनीश्वरत्वं चाभ्युपगम्यते इति प्रथितम्। अत्र—

"स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयेशितृत्वं नारायण त्वयि न मृष्यति वैदिकः।
ब्रह्मा शिवः शतमखः परमस्वराडित्येतेऽपि यस्य महिमार्णवविप्रुषस्ते" ॥

इत्यादयः स्तोत्ररत्नश्लोकाः प्रमाणम्। श्रीवाराहेऽष्टपञ्चाशेऽध्याये—

"सस्त्रीकं च हरिं पूज्य रुद्रं वात्रोमया सह।
या श्रीः सा गिरिजा प्रोक्ता यो हरिः स त्रिलोचनः ॥ ३ ॥

एवं सर्वेषु शास्त्रेषु पुराणेषु च गद्यते।
एतस्मादन्यथा यस्तु ब्रूते शास्त्रं पृथक्तया ॥ ४ ॥

रुद्रो जनानां मर्त्यानां काव्यं शास्त्रं न तद्भवेत्।
विष्णुं रुद्रकृतं ब्रूयात् श्रीगौरीति निगद्यते।
एतयोरन्तरं यच्च सोऽधर्मेत्युच्यते बुधैः" ॥ ६ ॥

इति सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"यो विष्णुः स स्वयं ब्रह्मा यो ब्रह्मासौ महेश्वरः।
वेदत्रये च यज्ञेऽस्मिन् पण्डितेष्वेष निश्चयः ॥ २६ ॥

यो भेदं कुरुतेऽस्माकं त्रयाणां द्विजसत्तम।
स पापकारी दुष्टात्मा दुर्गतिं समवाप्नुयात् ॥ २७ ॥

मां विष्णोर्व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्माणं च द्विजोत्तम।
भजन्ते पापकर्माणस्ते यान्ति नरकं नराः" ॥ ४० ॥

इति, एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"प्रणम्य शिरसा देवं यावत्पश्यामि हे नृप ।
तावत् तस्यैव रुद्रस्य देहस्थं कमलासनम् ॥ २ ॥
नारायणं च हृदये त्रसरेणुप्रमाणकम् ।
ज्वलद्भास्करवर्णाभं पश्यामि भवदेहतः" ॥ ३ ॥ इति
यज्ञेऽस्मिन् यद्धुतं हव्यं मामुद्दिश्य महर्षयः ।
ते त्रयोऽपि वयं भागं गृह्णीमः कविसत्तमाः ॥ ६ ॥
नास्माकं विविधो भावो वर्तते मुनिसत्तमाः ।
सम्यग्दृशः प्रपश्यन्ति विपरीतेष्वनेकशः" ॥ ७ ॥ इति,

द्विसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

"विष्णुरेव परं ब्रह्म त्रिभेदमिह पठ्यते ।
वेदसिद्धान्तमार्गेषु तन्न जानन्ति मोहिताः ॥ ४ ॥
अहं विष्णुस्तथा वेदा ब्रह्मकर्मणि चाच्युत ।
एतत् त्रयं त्वेकमेव न पृथग्भावयेत् सुधीः ॥ १४ ॥
योऽन्यथा भावयेदेतत् पक्षपातेन सुव्रत ।
स याति नरकं घोरं तेनैवं पापपूरुषः" ॥ १४ ॥ इति,

त्रयःसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—"विष्णुरुवाच

वरं वरय भद्रोऽस्तु देवदेव उमापते ।
न भेदश्चावयोर्देव एकावावामुभावपि" ॥ इति,

सप्ताशीत्यधिकशततमेऽध्याये—

"एकमूर्तिस्त्रिधा जातो ब्रह्मविष्णुहरात्मकः ॥ १२ ॥
क्रोधहेतोर्मया सृष्ट ईश्वरोऽसुरनाशनः ।
मम नाभ्यामभवत्पद्मं पद्मगर्भः पितामहः ॥ १३ ॥
एवं वयं त्रिधा देवाः कृत्वा ह्येकार्णवां महीम् ।
तिष्ठामः परमप्रीत्या मायां कृत्वा तु वैष्णवीम्" ॥ १४ ॥

इत्येभिर्वचनै रामानुजसंप्रदायासंमतं त्रिमूर्त्यैक्यं त्रिमूर्तिसाम्यं वा प्रतिपाद्यते। किं च, स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये "कस्योदरे" इति श्लोकव्याख्याने वाराहे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये विद्यमानानि "त्रिधात्मानं स भगवान् ससर्ज परमेश्वरः" इत्यादीनि वचना-

न्युद्धृत्य "त्रिधाऽऽत्मानम्" इत्येतत् स्वेन रूपेण क्षेत्रज्ञद्वयविशिष्टरूपेण चेति बहुप्रमाणानुसारेण मन्तव्यम्" इति क्लिष्टगत्या योजनेन निस्वीयते यत् श्रीरामानुज-संप्रदायानभ्युगतः "एकं त्रेधा विभक्तम्" इति तत्त्वमुक्ताकलापे निरसनीयपक्षेष्वन्य-तमत्वेन परिगणितः पक्ष एवात्र स्वरसतः प्रतिपाद्यत इति ॥

(२) शरणागतेन दीक्षितेन वैष्णवेन वर्णाश्रमधर्मा यावज्जीवं कैङ्कर्यात्मना-ऽनुष्ठेया इति रामानुजसिद्धान्तस्य विरुद्धो दीक्षितस्य शरणागतस्य वर्णाश्रमधर्म-त्यागस्य प्रतिपादकानि वचनानि वराहपुराणेऽष्टविंशत्यधिकशततमेऽध्याये मन्त्रः— त्यक्तानि विष्णो शस्त्राणि त्यक्तं सर्वं क्षत्रियकर्म सर्वं त्यक्त्वा देवं विष्णुं प्रपन्नोऽथ संसाराद्वै जन्मनां तारयस्व" ॥७॥ "मन्त्रः—अहं वैश्यो भवन्तमुपागतः प्रमुच्य कर्माणि च वैश्ययोगम् । दीक्षा च लब्धा भगवत्प्रसादात्प्रसीदतां मे भवबन्ध-मोक्षणम्" ॥१७॥ इति । मन्त्रः—

शूद्रोऽहं शूद्रकर्माणि मुक्त्वा भक्ष्यं च सर्वशः ।
भक्ष्याभक्ष्यं ततस्त्यक्त्वा त्यक्त्वा च शूद्रकर्म च" ॥२६॥

इत्येवंरूपेणोपलभ्यन्ते ॥ एषां धर्मस्वरूपत्यागे एव स्वारस्यम् । धर्म-स्वरूपत्यागो रामानुजसंप्रदायविप्रतीपः ।

(३) रामानुजसंप्रदाये सकामकर्माणि मुमुक्षवनिष्टफलप्रदत्वाविशेषात् "न सुकृतं न दुष्कृतम्, सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निवर्तन्ते" इतिश्रुत्यनुरोधपापकोटौ-निवेश्य त्याज्यत्वेन निर्णीतानि । परंतु वराहपुराणे अष्टादशाध्यायादारभ्य चतुस्त्रिंशा-ध्यायान्तेष्वध्यायेषु नवतितमादध्यायादारभ्य द्वादशाधिकशततमाध्यायान्तेषु अध्यायेषु अन्यत्र च सकामकर्माणि कर्तव्यत्वेनानुशिष्यन्ते । अयं मोक्षैकान्त-धर्मप्रतिपादनतत्परस्य श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायस्यासम्मतोऽर्थः । इत्थं कतिपयानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायविरुद्धानामर्थानां श्रीवराहपुराणे वर्णनदर्शनात् विप्रतिपन्नान् परवादिनः प्रति श्रीवराहपुराणवचनानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषु प्रमाणत्वेनो-पादानात् उभयवादिसंप्रतिपन्नानामेव वचनानां प्रमाणत्वेनोदाहरणीयत्वाच्चाध्यवसीयते श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायसंमतानां बहूनामर्थानां वर्णनस्य वराहपुराणे दर्शनेपीदं पुराणं न रामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिः प्राचीनैर्विद्वद्भिर्निर्मितं परिवर्धितं वेति, किंतु श्रीरामा-नुजसंप्रदायाविर्भावाद् बहोः कालात्प्रागेवेदं पुराणं वेदव्यासादिभिर्निर्मितं चेति च।

TELUGU VERSIONS OF THE PURĀṆAS

By

K. V. Ramakoti Sastry

['पुराण' पत्रिकायाः द्वितीये भागे २२५-२४२ पृष्ठेषु डा० 'वे० राघवन्' महोदयेन तामिलपुराणानामुपपुराणानां च सविस्तरं वर्णनं प्रस्तुतम्। तामेव सरणिमनुसृत्य वर्त्तमानलेखस्य लेखकमहोदयेनात्र तेलुगुपुराणवाङ्मयस्य मुद्रितस्यामुद्रितस्य च परिचयः प्रस्तुतः। तेलुगु-साहित्ये संस्कृतपुराणवाङ्मयस्य प्रभावः स्पष्टं लक्ष्यते। त्रयोदशीं शताब्दी-मारभ्य वर्तमानकालं यावत् तेलुगुभाषायां संस्कृतपुराणानामुपपुराणानां च गद्य-पद्यमिश्रिता बहवः स्वतन्त्रा अनुवादा रचिताः। केषुचिदनुवादेषु च मूलसंस्कृतपुराणानां अध्यायानां श्लोकानां चोल्लेखा अपि प्राप्यन्ते। संस्कृतेऽप्रसिद्धानि कानिचिदुपपुराणान्यपि तेलुगुभाषायां प्राप्यन्ते, तेषामप्यत्र वर्णनं प्रदत्तम्। सर्वेष्वेव तेलुगुपुराणेषु महर्षिः कृष्णद्वैपायनो व्यास सर्वेषामेव पुराणानां कर्ता मन्यते।]

The Purāṇic literature of our country is an eternal treasure, enriching our culture and ennobling our national character from times immemorial. Our Indian culture withstood the hostile onslaughts of several currents throughout the ages. To day we find the noble features of our heritage passed on firm and intact with all the necessary vitality frm the ancients. As an important component of national literature, the influence and impact of the purāṇas on Telugu literature needs no special emphasis. It struck deep roots in the life of the Telugu-speaking people.

Purāṇas had their heyday when in good olden days native princes and their subordinates patronised the poets and scholars who with zeal and devotion rendered Purāṇas into Telugu. The people evinced keen interest and great regard which led to the promotion and flourishing of the Purāṇic Literature in Telugu for the last so many centuries. NANNAYA, the first and the foremost of our Telugu poets of the 11th

century, referred to himself as a well-versed scholar in all the Purāṇas. He further referred to the court of his patron king Rajaraja as it was studied with a good number of Purāṇic Scholars i.e. Paurāṇikas. His testimony bears ample evidence to the fact that the Purāṇas had a great reputation and influence and had their pride of place in this land, It is significant to find that even the present-day scholars and poets carry on with their ever-growing literary activity of rendering the Sanskrit originals into Telugu, and thus add to the wealth of our literature. This Purāṇic consciousness indeed bridges our past, present and future and thus contributes to the enrichment of our culture.

The mass appeal of the Purāṇas was due to the impressive presentation with necessary explanation by the specialised scholars on the public platforms. This was the media of propagating the ethical values of the Purāṇas throughout this country. Even today we find such practice, especially on religious occasions. There are families completely devoted to this mission; and with the passage of time they came to be known as PURĀṆAM VARU, and their succeeding generations bear the surname PURĀṆAM. Another peculiar point of interest is that some of the families take after the surname of that particular Purāṇa they are associated with, e. g. BHĀGAVATULA, BHĀRATULA etc.

We can safely say that the Purāṇas started appearing in Telugu versions by the end of 13th century. This rendering continued all through and even to this day. A striking paradox in the course of our Telugu literature is that the dawn of the 20th century saw on one hand the rendering of the Purāṇas into Telugu, and on the other had the upheaval of the recent western literary trends.

My endeavour in this paper is to present a detailed chronological order of the Telugu versions of the Purāṇas with the necessary data of the re-renderings. First of all, I would like to give the main characteristics of the Telugu versions as follows:

1. All the Telugu versions contain both prose and verse.
2. A few of them give the number of Adhyāyas and Ślokas of their original Sanskrit texts.
3. All of them unanimously acknowledge the 'Venerable sage of uncommon wisdom' Veda-vyāsa (Kṛishṇa-Dvaipāyana) as the author of their originals.
4. Word to word translation is something foreign to many of the Telugu versions.
5. Generally versification in the Telugu versions speaks of a very easy flow of style and at times easier than the prose passages they contain.
6. There are cases where the authors exhibit a free and flexible handling of the material in their Telugu renderings and at the same time they are faithful to the spirit and meaning, i. e., tātparyārtha of their originals.

At present some of the Telugu versions of the Purāṇas are not traceable, and some are in the neglected state. This causes concern and compels for a thorough undertaking and vigorous efforts to trace and to bring to light. Expecially the Telengana area deserves special attention for a complete and a thorough survey. No doubt it is heartening to find that the present day scholars are doing their best in this connection, but it needs much more research to 'save' the soul of our literature. However, we have ample Purāṇic literature in Telugu on hand to-day.

MĀRKAṆḌEYA-PURĀṆA

A. Among the Purāṇas this is the first[1] that has been translated into Telugu. The name of the poet is MARANA. He belongs to the 14th century A. D. Scholars are of the opinion that this Purāṇa might have been written at about 1320 A. D.[2] Even though this is a translation of the Sanskrit original, there are places where the Telugu poet dealt independently. We do not know why this poet did not touch in the end of his work the stories of NARISHYANTA and DAMANA, the son and grandson respectively of the great MARUTH. This Telugu

version which is in eight Āśvasas with 2477 gadya-padyas concludes with the glorified story of MARUTH.

B. NARASIMHA KAVI is another person, whose name we hear as the author of a Telugu version of this Purāṇa.[3]

C. OUBALA KAVI (1540 A. D.) has also rendered Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa[4] into Telugu, the whereabouts of which are not known.

D. Another poet who translated Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa completely is MANDA KĀMEŚVARA KAVI who belongs to the last quarter of the 19th century. It is strange that this Kavi did not even mention at least any one of the above poets. If we compare both the texts of Marana and this Kavi, it will be clear that this Kavi has gone through the text of MARANA. This version ends with the war of DAMANA with VAPUṢMANTA the South Indian King. It seems that KAMEŚVARA KAVI'S translation is more close to the original than that of MARANA.[5]

PADMA-PURĀṆA

A. We are told by SRINADHA, a very well established Master poet of the latter half of the 14th century that KAMALA-NABHAMATYA, his grandfather, had written Padmapurāṇa-sangraha in Telugu. But that book has not yet come to us.

B. MADIKI SINGANA of the 14th century has given a Telugu version of the Padma purāṇa Uttarā Khaṇḍa.[6] There is a stray verse which is not included in the printed text in which the poet said that he has rendered Padmapurāṇa into Telugu, by which one can infer that he has translated the whole of the Padmapurāṇa. But we are aware of the Uttarā Khaṇḍa only.

C. KAMINENI MALLA REDDY'S Telugu version of this is available in print. He belongs to the second half of the 16th century. He did not translate the purāṇa completely. He has concentrated on Siva Rāghavanulapakadha only which forms part of Pātāla Khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa. This work begins with the arrival of Lord Śiva in the guise of a Rishi to

the court of Sri Rāma and extends to be an exposition of the Lord on various subjects to Śri Rāma in five Āśvasas with 1412 gadya-padyas.

D. We are having Paśupati Subbaraja Kavi's Mahāpurāṇa, the Telugu version of Māghamāhātmya which is a part of the uttara-khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa. Subbaraja Kavi has referred to Ramagiri Singana[8] as having rendered a part of Māghamāhātmya. Subbaraja Kavi of this century has published his work in 1924 A. D.

E. Pillalamarri Pinna Veerana who belongs to the 15th century, has translated the Māgha-māhātmya into Telugu. But nothing is available to us.

F. There is one more Telugu version of the Māgha-māhātmya, which forms part of the Padma Purāṇa, by Vedatam Seshacharya of this century. This work, in six Āśvasas and 2307 gadya-padyas, has been published by the author himself in the year 1932 A. D.

G. Rāmāśvamedha, which is a part and parcel of the Pātāla Khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa is said to have been rendered into Telugu by Tripurana Venkata Surya Prasada Raya Kavi[9] (1889-1945 A.D.)

H. The complete translation of the Padma Purāṇa we are having now is of Paśupati Chidambara Sastry who is known even in the court of Maharaja of Kāśi. This in four volumes is now available in print. Svarga Khaṇḍa is not referred in this Telugu version. And there is no such reference to Svarga Khaṇḍa in Pātāla Khaṇḍa of this Telugu version as shown by Asoka Chatterjee (Purāṇa, Volume No. 2 Page 175-183). Scholars are of the opinion that this Telugu version is very close to the Sanskrit original. This scholar poet Chidambara Sastry passed away on the eleventh day of Dec. 1951.

NARASIṀHA-PURĀṆA

A. YERRANA (1280-1345 A. D.)[10], one among the celebrated Kavitrayam, gave Narasiṁhapurāṇa also to Telugu people.

But this is neither a translation nor an adaptation. He has taken the story from the Brahmāṇḍa and Viṣṇu Purāṇas and developed it into a grand literary piece with his descriptive talent. Veluri Sivarama Sastry who edited this book for Vavilla Ramaswamy Sasturulu and Sons, Madras, has expressed his opinion that this Telugu Purāṇa is quite different from that of Gopala Narayana & Co., Bombay Sanskrit edition of the Narasiṁha-purāṇa.

B. There is reference[11] to the effect that one Proluganti Chennasauri of the 15th century also has translated this purāṇa into Telugu. But unfortunately this Telugu version is not available.

C. We possess Narasiṁhapurāṇa Uttarabhāga which belongs to Hari Bhattu of the 15th century, This Telugu version, in five Aśvasas with 1000 gadya-padyas, deals with the later life story of Prahlāda i. e. his war with Viṣṇu and Indra etc.

D. Bārigadpula Dharmayamatya is another poet with whose name there is one Narasiṁhapurāṇa in manuscript. Dr. B. Rama Raju[12] writing about this poet, placed him in the first quarter of the 18th century. Though the name of this work is Narasiṁhapurāṇa, actually the text is very peculiar in six cantos. The first ends with the story of Jaya and Vijaya. The second one contains the stories of Nārada-Suparṇa-Ambarīṣa-Kārtyavīryārjuna and Paraśurāma etc., The third and fourth cantos deal with Hiraṇyākaśipu, Hiraṇyākṣa and Prahlāda. The fifth one is nothing but an abridged story of Rāmāyaṇa, whereas the sixth deals with the story of Śrīkrishṇa.

E. Kotikalapudi Kodanda Rama Kavi's (1807-1883) Telugu version of this purāṇa is available only in manuscript.[13]

VIṢṆU-PURĀṆA

A. Paśupati Naganādha of the 14th century is said to have translated Viṣṇupurāṇa.[14] We have only one verse from that Purāṇa describing VASANTARTU today in the Telugu Academy at Kakinada.

B. There is one translation of this purāṇa belonging to to the 16th century. The name of the author is Vennelakanti Sūrana. It is distinct in the preface of the Telugu version that this work is a translation of Parāśarasaṁhitā i. e. Vishṇu-purāṇa a part of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa. This is some what confusing but we can find the same in the original Sanskrit Viṣṇupurāṇa printed in Telugu script by Srikanchi.pra. Annangaracharya (Iti Sarvapurāṇanāmādibhūtē Brhmāṇdākhyē Mahāpurāṇē Vudhrutāyām Pārāśaryasaṁhitāyām Sri Viṣṇu Puranē..) Seshadri Ramana Kavulu, the editors of Telugu version are of opinion that Surana did not actually follow the original Sanskrit and even this is not a complete translation of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa. Surana has limited himself to the first part of the purāṇa which is full of stories glorifying Viṣṇu and Śṛkṛṣṇa leaving the second part that describes various Dharmas, Vratas and Philosophy etc., This in eight Āśvasas with 3010 gadya-padyas.

C. Kalidindi Bhāvanārāyāṇa of the 16th century is another poet to translate the Viṣṇupurāṇa into Telugu. This has been edited and published by the University of Madras in the year 1930 A.D. This version contains only four Aṁśas and 1806 gadya-padyas. It is doubtful whether Bhāvanārāyaṇa has completely rendered the purāṇa including the last two Aṁśas of the original or not. The editors, late K. Ramakrishnaiah, Reader of the Madras University, and P. Lakshmikantam, the present professor in Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi, after comparing the Telugu version with the original, expressed sincerely in their introduction that Bhāvanārāyaṇa has followed the Sanskrit original more closely than any other translator of any other purāṇa. Of course they have clearly stated where the poet introduced his original ideas too though they are negligible in character.

D. Dittakavi Venkatāmātya (17th century) is also said to have given a Telugu rendering of this purāṇa of which the other particulars are not known.

E. Mudumrai Deekshitulu of the 19th century is another poet to translate this Viṣṇupurāṇa.[16]

F. CHAKRAPURI RAGHAVĀCHARI[16] is one more name with which we can find a Telugu Viṣṇupurāṇa. But this not at all a translation of any Sanskrit original. It is an independent work by itself giving information about yamaloka and Rāmānuja's religious and philosophic activities.

G. Two prose versions of this Viṣṇupurāṇa, one by Tupakula Ananta Bhupati[17] of the 18th century and the other one by Nori Gurulinga Sastry, are also in Telugu. The second one has been published in August 1904 A.D.

H. There is one Seetaramasiddanti[18] with whose name we are informed that there is a Telugu version of Viṣṇupurāṇa.

SKANDA-PURĀṆA.

Except a reference[19] to one NALLA REDDY (1667-1696 A.D.) as the author of the Telugu Skandapurāṇa by Kundurti Venkatachal Kavi of the 18th century, we know nothing more either of the poet of his purāṇa. So we can say that no poet upto now has translated the whole of the Skanda Purāṇa into Telugu. But there are poets who have given Telugu versions to the many parts of the Purāṇa. They are in nutshell as follows :—

1. GODĀVARĪ KHAṆḌA :—This Telugu version of this Khaṇḍa is the work of Srinadha, the most famous among the Telugu poets, belonging to the 14th century. He has re-named it Bhīmeśvarapurāṇa. The reason that he gives to justify his title is that there is nothing but the glorification of the God Dakṣarāma Bhīmeśvara in Godāvarikhaṇḍa and hence it can be called Bhīmeśvarapurāṇa as well. This work is in six cantos with 1035 gadya-padyas.

2. KĀŚĪ KHAṆḌA :—This is also the work of the above poet Srinadha in seven cantos and nearly 1750 gadya-padyas. We have one more translation of this Kāsikhaṇḍa in Telugu prose by Nanja Raju belonging to the latter half of the 18th century. This is a true translation of the original following of the Adhyāya Krama.[20]

3. KEDĀRA KHAṆḌA :- PEDAPATI SOMAIAH[21] (1500 A. D.) is the first man to translate this Khaṇḍa. But his Telugu version is lost. There is another unpublished translation of this Khaṇḍa by Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma[22] of this century.

4. ARUṆĀCHALA KHAṆḌA :—The above-referred Somaiah is said to have rendered this Khaṇḍa also into Telugu as Arunachalapurana.[23]

5. KAUMARIKA KHAṆḌA:—This is the work of the above-mentioned Seshadri Sarma in three Āśvasas with 4847 gadya-padyas. According to the author, the Sanskrit original that he has followed is in 66 adhyāyas.

6. NAGARA KHAṆḌA :—We are having a Telugu version of this by Turaga Rajakavi and Ayyanki Balasarasvati of the 16th century.[24] A recent translation of this in 10 Āśvasas and 8952 gadya-padyas by Janapati Pattabhi Ramasastry (1900) in Telugu is available in 4 volumes having been published in 1923, 25, 28 and 34 respectively.

7. BRAHMOTTARA KHAṆḌA :—Pidupanti Basavana's (1470-1500 A. D.) is the first translation of this khaṇḍa in Telugu in Dwipada metre.[25] Another Telugu version of this Khaṇḍa in five Āśvasas by Linganaradhya is in manuscript.[26] Pochiraju Veeraya Kavi alias Kolakaluri Verrana[27] also has rendered into Telugu Vibhūti Rudrākṣa Māhātmya, a part of the Brahmottarakhaṇḍa. There are three other poets who have rendered this into Telugu. They are Sridharamalla Venkata Rama Kavi, Mutturaju Venkata Krishna Kavi and Pratakota Mallaiah Kavi,[28] Venkata Rama Kavi's Telugu version is now available in print. He belongs to the 18th century. Pattamatta Soma Nadha Somayaji (1520-1630), a great scholar poet has also translated this Brahmottarakhaṇḍa, into Telugu.

8. ŚIVARAHASYA KHAṆḌA :—The Telugu version of this is the work of Kodoori Venkatachala Kavi belonging to the second half of the 17th century. This Telugu version is complete in seven khaṇḍas namely, Sambhava, Asura, Veeramahandra, Yuddha, Deva, Dakṣa and Upadeṣa and has been published. Another Telugu version of this in Dwipada metre by

Oubalakavi can be found in manuscript.[29] Venkayalapati Veerbhadra Kavi[30] and Revuri Anantayaja (18th century)[31] are referred to be the authors of the Telugu versions of this Khaṇḍa. One Mulugu Ayyavarlu[32] is also said to have rendered this khaṇḍa into Telugu.

9. DHARMA KHAṆḌA :—We have only one Telugu version of this by Edulapalle Bhavanisa Kavi of the 18th century. This, in nine Āśvasas with 3163 gadya-padyas, deals mainly with the life story of Vālmīki.

10. SREESALLA KHAṆḌA :—Seshanaradhya (1500 A. D.) rendered this into Telugu in six cantos and named it Sri Parvata Purāṇa. This has been published in 1888 A. D. by Padurti Akkyyadevara of Madras. Another poet who translated this into Telugu is Attaluri Papakavi of the 18th century. This is in manuscript.[33]

11. SETU KHAṆḌA :—Papayamatya's Telugu version of this Khaṇḍa is in manuscript.[34] One more version in five cantos by Damera Venkata Raya Kavi also can be seen in manuscript.[35]

12. MAHEŚVARA KHAṆḌA :—We have a prose translation of this which includes Kedāra, Kaumārika and Aruṇāohala Khaṇḍas by Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu of this age. This has been published as Āndhraskhaṇḍa first part in the year 1959.

13. PRABHĀSA KHAṆḌA :—The Telugu version of this belongs to Chaganti Bhakaralinga Sastry of these times. It is learnt that he has neither completed nor published it.

14. SŪTA SAMHITĀ :—Pattamatta Somanadha Somayaji who has been referred to above in this paper, is the author of the Telugu version of this Saṁhitā. He has translated this even without leaving 'Tu and Cha', to quote his own words, following Tātparyā-dīpikā the commentary of Vidyāraṇya, in seven Āśvasas with approximately 2000 gadya-padyas. It is supposed that this version might have come out in 1578 A. D.

15. ŚANKARA SAṀHITĀ :—There are two Telugu versions of this Saṁhitā in manuscript[36] both of which are very

much worn out and are of unknown authorship. Sivaramalinga Kavi[37] in the year 1733 A.D. translated this in three Āśvasas and named it Vīra Śaivācāra Sangraha. Two other writers Nanja Raja[38] of the 18th century and Mallamapalle Buchikavi (19th century ?) whose date is not exactly known, have rendered Halasyamāhātmya which forms part of this Śankara Saṁhitā into Telugu. Nanja Raja's version is in prose whereas Buchikavi's is in Campū in six Āśvasas and 3458 gadyapadyas. This Halasyamāhātmya has again been translated by Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma in six Āśvasas with 2296 gadyapadyas. The Two Telugu versions of Buchi Kavi and Seshadri Sarma are available in print, being published in 1943 and 1906. There is one Skandapurāṇetihāsmañjarī, a prose translation in Telugu. The name of the author, as the catalogue says, is Nori Gurlinga Sastry. One more prose version of Sivarahasya Khaṇḍa (Sambhava Khaṇḍa) in Telugu is the work of Mudigonda Veeresalinga Sastry. This has been published with the original in Telugu script in 1926 A.D.

Here I would like to draw the attention of the learned scholars to some of the important points that concern the Skanda Purāṇa basing on the Telugu versions mentioned above. Srinadha the first Telugu poet to place his hand on the Skanda purāṇa, has desciibed in his Bhimeśvarapurāṇa, as it is fulfilling the five lakṣaṇas and having sapādalakshagrandhas. Again he refers to it in his Kāśi Khaṇḍa as having six Saṁhitās, i.e. Sanatkumāra-Sūta-Śaṅkara-Vaiṣṇava-Brahma and Saura and Pañcaśatakhaṇḍas like Pañcha Nagara, Kamalālaya, Revā, Ekavīra, Mailara, Godāvarī Khaṇḍas etc, According to his reading the saṁhitās contain pañcāśatsahasrika, Śatasahasrika, Triṁsatsahasrika, Pañcasahasrika, Trisahasrika and Ekasahasrika respectively. He further points out that some are of the opinion that Kāśīkhaṇḍa is Vedavyāsa Sūtasamvādātmakam. Srinadha's reading of the slokas of the saṁhitas is quite similar to that of the number given in the Sanskrit original. According to Pattamatta Somanadha Somayāji Śivamāhātmya, Jñānayoga, Mukti, and Yajñavaibhava Khaṇḍas form Sūta Saṁhita. Nanja Raja has referred Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as Agastyasaṁhita.

Halāsyamāhātmya gives us an explanation that because Agastya is the person that narrated the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā it is called Agastyasaṁhitā also. Buchi Kavi further says that there are 50 khaṇḍas altogether in the six saṁhitās of the Skanda purāṇa. Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu speaks of this Purāṇa as there are two versions in Sanskrit, one with saṁhitās and the other with Khaṇḍas and upakhaṇḍas. And again he refers to the second version as having seven main khaṇḍas, Maheśvara etc.

The seven khaṇḍas of Saṅkara Saṁhitā (Tamil Kanda Purana) as Dr. V. Raghavan gives, are one and the same in order too, in Śivarahasya Khaṇḍa as has been given by the Telugu poet Venkatachalakavi with a slight change regarding the first and the third. The Telugu poet gives sambhava in the place of Utpatti and adds Veera to Mahendra which makes no difference at all. The point to be noted here is whether Śaṅkara Saṁhitā and Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa are one with two names, or are they separate books ? As Dr. Raghavan admits, the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa forms part of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā. Then how is it possible that the whole of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā to have seven kandas only that makes Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa ?

If Śivarahasya Khaṇḍa is a part of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā, then what about the other parts of it ? Because the Tamil translation of the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa, as Dr. Raghavan puts it, is in two kāṇḍas we have to request him to give the names of those two kāṇḍas which will solve the problem. According to the Telugu poet Venkatachalkavi, there are Twelve khaṇḍas in Śaṅkara Saṁhitā of which the Śivarahasya khaṇḍa is the first having seven kāṇḍas in itself. This is all because to say that the Tamil Kanda purana must be a translation of Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa only and that it cannot be of the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as a whole as has been opined by Dr. V. Raghavan.* Another point to be noted is in the original text of Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa printed in Telugu script we are told of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as

*Tamil versions of the purāṇas by Dr. V. Raghavan, (Purāṇa Vol. II No. 1 and 2, pages 225-246).

having two parts and the first in seven kāṇḍas with 10,000 ślokas is known as Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa. Again we are supplied with foot notes "Vistareṇa Suvistrutā" for "Dvibhāgaissayutaca tat" and "Tatgrandhai Trayodasa Sāhasraiśca" for "Tam-grandhai Dasasāhasrai" (Sambhava Kāṇḍa Dvitīyodhyāya, 60, 61). The Sanskrit original Śivarahasyakhanda is not referring to the twelve khaṇḍas of the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā and the Telugu translation of it by Venkatachal Kavi is giving a different independent version of the Khaṇḍas of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā on one hand, and on the other taking the footnote reading of the ślokas. Some sincere enquiry is needed to be definite of the parts or khaṇḍas of Śaṅkarasaṁhitā and of the Ślokas of Śivarahasya khaṇḍa.

NĀRADĪYA-PURĀṆA

Pillamari Pinaveeraṇa of the latter half of the 15th century has mentioned Nāradiya purāṇa[39] as his previous work in Telugu of which the whereabouts are not known. There are two other poets, namely Vasiraju Ramaiah (1500 A.D. ?) and Kottalanka Mrutyunjaya Kavi[40] who are said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu. A complete palm-leaf manuscript of this purāṇa belonging to Allada Narasimha Kavi is available.[41] The above mentioned Mrutyunjaya Kavi's Telugu version in six cantos called Bruhannaradeeya is also available in manuscript.[42]

VARĀHA-PURĀṆA

The Telugu version of this Purāṇa in twelve Āśvasas and 1709 gadya-padyas is the work of Nandi Malliah and Ghanta singaiah who belong to the 15th century. This has been edited and published in 1904 A.D. by Kandukuri Veeresalingam Pantulu. Another poet Hari Bhattu who has been referred to above in this paper, also gave a Telugu rendering to the Ādikāṇḍa of this purāṇa. This is available in manuscript.[43]

BHĀGAVATA-PURĀṆA

A. The famous Bhakta Kavi Potana (1450-1500 A.D.) is the author of this purāṇa in Telugu. Unfortunately the present

available text is not completely Potana's. 1 to 4, 7th and 10th of the twelve skandhas are from the pen of Potana. The fifth skandha is by Gangaiah, sixth by Singaiah and the last two i.e. 11th and 12th by Veligandala Naraiah. These three poets are said to be Potana's disciples. Any how this Telugu Bhāgavatapurāṇa enjoys a great reputation in this region even today.

B. Madikisingana (14th century) has rendered only the Dasamaskandha of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa which is even now in manuscript.[44]

C. Sixth, eleventh, and twelfth skandhas of this purāṇa have been rendered into Telugu by Hari Bhattu (15th century.[45]

D. A Telugu version of this purāṇa in Dvipāda metre by Tekumalla Rangasai can be seen in manuscript.[46]

E. Sripada Krishna Moorthy, Sastry, the late poet-laureate of Andhra Pradesh, has one Telugu Bhāgavatapuıāṇa to his credit.

F. Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma, a great scholar poet of this century, seems to have rendered the Dasamaskandha of the purāṇa into Telugu as Tandavakrishna Bhāgavatam.

G. Kokkireni Narasimha Raya Kavi has translated the eleventh Skandha of this purāṇa. The author quotes the original Sanskrit ślokas and gives his translation in verse and writes Tātparya and explains it in detail. This peculiar translation has been published in 1914 (Madras).

H. 11th and 12th Skandhas of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa have been recently translated into Telugu by Minnikanti Gurunadha Sarma of Guntur. This true translation with the title Sri Madguru Bhagavatham has been published in 1952. In his introduction to this work Durbha Subrahmanya Sarma, a scholar-poet of Nellore, has referred to two poets who translated this Purāṇa into Telugu, Kovuri Pathabhiramaiah (11th Skandha only) and Sriman Sampanmudhumba Singaracharya (1, 2, 5, 10, 11 and 12th Skandhas only) Subrahmanya Sarma is doubtful whether Singaracharya has rendered the remaining Skandha of the Purāṇa or not.

We have a complete true translation of the Bhāgavata purana by Gandham Srirama Murthy and Irrinki Narsimha Murthy who are known as Sri Rama Nrusimha Murthy Kavulu belonging to the present day. This version is published in five volumes in 1955 A. D.

MATSYA—PURĀṆA.

A. Haribhattu's Telugu version of this purāṇa is the first of its kind. The late Manvalli Ramakrishna kavi has brought this into light from Gadwal. This has been first published by Oletivenkata Rama Sastry of Pittapuram in his magazine KAVITA. It is believed to be an incomplete translation limiting itself to the Viṣṇudharmottara khaṇḍa.[47]

B. Lingamaganta Ramakavi (1650 AD) is one that is said to have translated this purāṇa.[48]

C. Kanadam Peddana of the 18th century the poet of surapura (Gadwal ?) Samstan has also translated this purāṇa.[49]

D. Manda Kamesvara Kavi is another name that is associated with a Telugu version of this.[50]

VĀYU—PURĀṆA.

We hear of only one Oddepadi Peddana (1500 A. D.) as having rendered Māghamāhātmya[51] which is a part of this purāṇa into Telugu.

GARUDA—PURĀṆA.

Pingali Surana of the 16th century said that he had translated this purāṇa.[52] But not even a single manuscript of this is to be found.

ŚIVADHARMOTTARA

The Telugu composition of this by Raja Malla Reddy of the 16th century is in 8 cantos with 1167 gadya-padyas. This has been published in 1913 A.D.

VĀMANA—PURĀṆA.

A. Yelakuchi Bala Sarsavathi and Lingamagunta Rama Kavi (1550 A. D.) are said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu.[53]

B. A Telugu version of this purāṇa in ten cantos by Oubalakavi (1540 A.D.) is available in manuscript.[54]

C. The present available Telugu version of this in print is the work of Ramavajhala Kondaiah Sastry of this century. This version is in twelve Skandhas with 4443 gadya-padyas.[55]

KŪRMA—PURĀṆA.

A. Rajalingakavi of the 17th century has given a complete translation of this purāṇa in Telugu which is still in manuscript.[56]

B. Manda Kamesvara Kavi of the 19th century,[57] who has been referred to above, is also said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu of which we know nothing more.

LIṄGA—PURĀṆA.

A. Without any concrete evidence, we are being told[58] that there is a Telugu version of this purāṇa by Tenali Ramakrishna Kavi of the 16th century.

B. Of this Liṅga Purāṇa we have a recent translation in Telugu by Mulugu Chandramouli Sastry which has been published in two parts (pūrvārdha and uttarārdha or Bhāga) in 1929. We have a preface in prose by the author himself published in the first part from which we can know something new about the Sanskrit original. According to that there are 109 Adhyāyas in pūrvārdha and 55 Adhyāyas in Uttarārdha.[59] One more important point we have to note, as the author says, is that the editors of the Liṅga Purāṇa Bombay edition have dropped some ślokas in the uttarārdha which tell us about Śivaliṅga Dīkshā, Liṅga Dharma and Liṅga pūjā. Those slokas are from Nandeesvara (Sailadi), Sanatkumara Samvāda. Actually they may have their place just after the exposition of the Guru-Śiṣya Lakṣaṇas i. e. in the Śiva pūjā Krama.

KALKI-PURĀṆA.

Chilakapati Ramanuj Sarma[60] is said to have given a Telugu version of this purāṇa in 1898 A. D. We have a prose translation of this in Telugu by Puvvada Balakrishna Rao

which is published for second time in 1925 A. D. This Telugu version gives the number of the Adhyāyas of the Sanskrit original as 35, and ślokas as 1600. 'Anubhāgavatam' is the additional title of this purāṇa.

BRAHMĀṆDA-PURĀṆA

A. We are furnished with a palm leaf manuscript[61] of the Telugu version of this purāṇa by Kavuri Yallaiah of the 16th century. This version has been described by Chaganti Seshaiah[62] as having the stories of Paraśurāma, Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa in six Āśvāsas. In the words of the author, his Telugu version of this purāṇa is 'Ardhapanchakavi jñāna.'

B. Devāṅgapurāṇa[63] in Dwipada metre by Bhadrakavi Lingakavi of the 16th Century is based on the above purāṇa in Sanskrit.

C. Mallupurana[64], the Telugu version of Mallukulakrama of the above purāṇa, is the work of Nudurupati Venkana belonging to the 18th century.

D. The present Telugu version of the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa we are having on hand is the work of Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma. This version consists of Prakriyā—Anuṣanga—Upodghāta and Upsaṁhāra padas and 6118 gadya-padyas. The author himself said of his translation that he had left some adjectives here and there and added some wherever he felt necessary. He pointed out further that he had completely the sixty first and sixty second adhyāyas of the upodghātapada which are on gandharva (Music). The reason, as he says, is that those two adhyāyas are beyond his capacity of understanding.

BRAHMA-PURĀṆA

The author of this Telugu version is also the above poet Seshadri Sarma. In accordance with the Sanskrit text, this Telugu version is also in 137 adhyāyas (6111 gadya-padyas).

ŚIVA-PURĀṆA

This is the last of all the purāṇas to be translated into Telugu. This is the work of Mudigonda Nagaveeresvara Kavi

of this century, and has been published in the year 1947. There are Sṛisṭi—Satī—Pārvatī—Kumāra—Yuddha—Leelā—Liṅga-vaibhava—Umā—Kailāśa—Vāyavīya and Vidyeśvara Khaṇḍas in this Telugu version. The author tells us that the Sanskrit original of this purāṇa is divided into saṁhitās and sub-divided into khaṇḍas, but he has dropped the word saṁhitā and used only the word khaṇḍa. The parts known as Śatarudra Saṁhitā and Koṭirudra saṁhitā in the original are named Līlākhaṇḍa and Liṅgavaibhava khaṇḍa in this Telugu version. Vidyeśvara Saṁhitā which is found in the beginning of the original has been shifted to the end as Vidyeśvara khaṇḍa. The author admits that he has enlarged the Pārvatī, Kumāra and Liṅgavaibhava khaṇḍas and has abridged Līlā, Umā, Kailāśa, Vāyavīya and Vidyeśvara Khaṇḍas to some extent, while rendering the Sṛiṣṭi, Satī and Yuddha khaṇḍas following the original very closely. Further he makes clear that he has dropped all sorts of repetitions in his Telugu version except the story of Brahmā's Panchama Śiraḥ Khaṇḍana which appears both in Līlākhaṇḍa and Liṅga-vaibhava Khaṇḍa. One major change that the author has introduced in his version is, as he says, instead of writing the story of Upamanyu for a second time in Vāyavīya Khaṇḍa following the original, he has replaced it by inserting the story of Mārkaṇ-ḍeya taking from Padmapurāṇa. The author has followed the Bombay edition of the Śivapurāṇa for his translation. Any how, if we want to make a comparative study of this Telugu version with the original, now and then we have to search Skanda, Bhāgavata, Mahābhārata, and Jābāla, Kālāgnirudro-panishats too as has been suggested by the author in his prose preface.

We have a Telugu translation of Jñānasaṁhitā only from Śivapurāṇa by Mantri Pregada Bhujanga Raya Kavi in in three asvasas and 441 gadya-padyas. I am unable to quote the date of its publication as the title page of the copy I have gone through is worn out.

DEVĪBHĀGAVATA—PURĀṆA

A. Mulugu Papayaradhya of the 18th century is the

first poet to translate this purāṇa into Telugu. This has been published and widely read.

B. Tripurana Tammaya belonging to the 19th century is referred by his son Venkata Surya Prasada Raya Kavi[65] as the author of the Devībhāgavata purāṇa. Except this much we know nothing of this Telugu version.

C. Dasu Sreerama Kavi (1864-1908) has also translated this purāṇa. It is said that he could finish the whole translation (1100 granthas) in only four (six ?) months[66]. This is available in print.

D. Tirupati, Venkata Kavulu, the epoch makers of this century, have also a Telugu version of the Devībhāgavata to their credit. Though the whole Telugu version goes by their name, but actually some of the skandhas have been written by their disciples. It is stated in the printed text.

E. We are having prose translations too of this purāṇa by S. Visvanadha Sastry and Stanapati Rukminamma of this century.

Janamanchi Venkata Subrahmanya Sarma has also recently translated and published this Devībhāgavata purāṇa.

BHAVIṢYA-PURĀṆA

We have only some prose translations of this purāṇa in Telugu in this century. Brahmaparva of this purāṇa has been published along with the original (216 adhyayas) in 1939 without giving the name of the prose translator by Vavilla Ramaswamny Sastrulu of Madras.

We have one great puranic scholar Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu, who has been referred to above in this paper, by whom we may say that all of the purāṇas have been rendered into Telugu prose. There are of course others too who gave prose renderings of all the purāṇas in this century. Because they were meant for laymen, it is but natural with them to be concise. Astadasapuranam by Oleti Venkata Lakshmi Narsimha Sarma may be mentioned in this respect. As

a matter of fact the attempt to give the purāṇas in Telugu prose in this region goes back to Nineteentwenties when the Purāṇa Grantha Mālikā was started under the editorship of Nadakuduti Veeraraju Pantulu at Pitapuram Śiva, Brahma, Vāmana etc., have come out through that Granthamālikā.

DATTABHĀGAVATA

The author of this work is Tadepalli Raghavanarayana Sastry of this century. This Bhāgavata glorifies Dattadeva as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu and contains some other stories like Alarka, Kārtavīrya, Kanchanamalini, Parasurama, Vena and Nahuṣa etc. in twelve parts known as Guchas with 2865 verse. This has been published in the year 1955.

GARGA—SAṀHITĀ.

The Telugu version of this Saṁhitā, by Chivukuha Appaya Sastry of this century, is named as Gargabhāgavata. This version is having ten Khaṇḍas namely 1. Goloka 2. Brundavana 3. Giriraja 4. Madhurya 5. Madhura 6. Dwaraka 7. Visvajith 8. Balabhadra 9. Vijnana 10. Asvamedha. According to Sivasankar Sastry the pioneer of the modern Telugu, the original Gargasaṁhitā is with 12,000 ślokas.

BHĀRGAVA—PURĀṆA.

We have a Telugu version of this purāṇa which bears an additional title Nityasūricharitra dealing with the surprising stories of Butamuni, Mahamuni etc. in seven Āśvāsas by Kanduri Venkata Dasa kavi (19th century ?) In the year 1922 A. D. this purāṇa has been edited and published by Chelkani. Lacharao of Chitrada. There is one manuscript with the name by Rajabahiri Pamanayaka Bhupal (1751.1773 A. D.)[67] of Surpura Samstan. This is in eight āśvāsas comprising the stories of Alwars. As the author himself says, the first canto of this Telugu Bhārgavapurāṇa contains the matter of the fifth adhyāya of the uttarakhaṇḍa of the original. Like this the author has taken the necessary subject matter from so many adhyāyas here and there that constitutes the uttar-

khaṇḍa of the Sanskrit Bhārgavapurana. So we cannot consider this version as a complete translation of the original.

GAṆEŚA—PURĀṆA

This Telugu purāṇa is the work of Sripada Krishnamurthy Sastry[68] referred to above in this paper. As this is not available now, we can speak nothing more of it.

VAIŚYA—PURĀṆA

Bhaskarāchārya (16th century)[69] is the author of this Telugu purāṇa which is in eight Āśvāsas only of which the first four deal with the story of the descending of the Vaiśyas from Kailāsa and the second four with that story of Vāsavīkanyā

ĀDI—PURĀṆA.

Sarvadeva[70] is said to be the author of this Telugu Purāṇa. The author may be placed at any time before 1500 A.D. We have only two stanzas from this purāṇa in the Telugu Academy at Kakinda.

ĀDITYA—PURĀṆA.

This is to be the work of Elakuchi Pinayaditya[71] who is supposed to be in the first quarter of the 17th century.

VĀSAVAKANYAKĀ—PURĀṆA

We have a prose version of this Purāṇa in Telugu. This has been published along with the Sanskrit origional in Telugu script by Arya Vaisya Yuvajana Sangham of Penugonda in 1951 A. D. According to the original this Purāṇa in 60 Adhyāyas and 3798 śloka is a part of Sanatsujāta Saṁhitā of Uttara Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa (Iti Sri Skande Uttara Khaṇḍe Sanatsujāta Samhitāyām............). This Sanatsujāta Samhitā may be another name to Santkumara Saṁhitā.

VIŚVAKARMĀ—PURĀṆA.

We have a palm-leaf manuscript of this Telugu purāṇa by one Venkatacharyudu.[72] There is another paper manuscript[73] of unknown authorship which goes by the Viśvabrahmapurāṇa.

Besides all this, there aɹe still some more texts in Telugu which pass under the name of purāṇa—Manuvaṁśapurāṇa, Gauḍapurāṇa, Sagarapurāṇa etc., and Māhātmyagranthas i. e. Sthalapurāṇas based simply on some purāṇic stories enjoying considerable reputation for their literary values, but the premises of my attempt in this paper concerns only the main purāṇas and Upapurāṇas and some of their major sections for which we have Telugu versions of the purāṇas one by one and discuss in detail comparing with their originals which may add something to the purāṇic studies.

NOTES

1. If we are furnished with the Narasimhapurāṇa of Vemulavada Bhimakavi (1100-1180 A. D.) that must have been the first Telugu version among the puranas.

2. AKT. Volume 3 page 167.

3. ALP. Serial No. 2319.

4. AKT. Volume 9 page 124.

5. We can take for example the Padminividyā. This has been rendered in detail completely by Kameshwara Kavi whereas it has been condensed into one stanza by Marana. I have compared this with the originals given by Dr. V. S. Agrawala (Purāṇa Volume 1. No. 2. page 183-197). But one interesting point may be said of Kamesvara Kavi here. His translation of नाजायन्त स्त्रियश्चैव काश्चिद-प्राप्तयौवनाः (VII. 3) corresponds exactly with those of N. N. Dutta and Charuchandra Mukerjee as poined out by Chintaharan Chakravarti (Purāṇa Volume 3 No. 1 page 44).

6. AKT. Volume 4 page 175.

7. Ramagirisingna and Madikasingana are one only. AKT. Volume 4 page 162.

8. AKT. Volume 6 page 33. As there is one Māghamāhātmya in Vāyupurāṇa also, we cannot without doubt, say, that this Pillamarri Pinaveerana's Māghamāhātmya is from Padmapurāṇa.

9. ARC. page 271.

10. Though Harivaṁsa is called purāṇa now and then, as it is not found in the authentic list of purāṇas, either Yerrana's Harivaṁsa or Nachana Somana's Uttara Harivaṁsa is not mentioned in this paper.

11. NPU. first canto stanza 33.

12. MPM. Page 1-6.

13. ALP. serial No. 1359.

14. AKT. volume 4 page 147. one Vaishnavapurāṇa by Dasakavi by available in manuscript in the Telugu academy, Kakinada.

15. TVS. volume 3 page 1172.

16. AKT. volume 12 page 192-194,

17. SST page 479,

18. IVS. page 11.
19. SST. page 370.
20. SST. page 482.
21. AKT. volume 8, page 226.
22. ARC. page 265.
23. AKT. volume 8, page 226.
24. AKT. volume 11, page 57.
25. VSL. pape 103.
26. DCT. No. 197.
27. VSL. pape 115.
28. ALP. serial No. 1738. This catalogue reads the author's name as Pullaiah.
29. ALP. serial No. 3281.
30. VSL. page 193.
31. SST. page 379.
32. PKV. page 1.
33. VSL. page 189.
34. ALP. serial No. 3749.
35. TCM. R. No. 543.
36. DCT. No. 357 and 358.
37. VSL. page 155.
38. SST. page 481 and 527.
39. AKT. volume 6, page 33.
40. AKT. volume 8, page 233.
41. ALP. serial No. 1310.
42. TCM. R. No. 86.
43. AKT. volume 8, page 170.
44. DCT. No. 307.
45. AKT. volume 8, page 172.
46. AKT. volume 12, page 75.
47. AKT. volume 3, page 176
48. AKT. volume 9, page 175.
49. KKS. page 235.
50. TVS. page 1197
51. AKT. volume 9 page 63. Andhramaghapuranam by Ramadasapradhani is in manuscript in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
52. AKT. volume 10 page 97. We have one more manuscript of this Telugu purana by Varadaraja kavi in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
53. AKT. volume 9 page 175.
54. ALP. page 265.
55. This Telugu version is not divided into two parts, and the author has not given any hint to infer that the original as having purvottarabhāgas according to the description given in the Nāradīya purana, chapter 105 (Purāṇa volume IV No. 1 page 187). The original sanskrit followed by author is the edition of Venkateswara Press, Bombay.
56. ALP. serial No. 635, 636, 637,

57. TVS. volume 3 page 1172.

58. AKT. volume 8 page 26.

59. According to Dr. V. S. Agrawala and Dr. V. Raghavan the purvārdha of this Liṅgapurāṇa contains only 108 adhyayas (Purāṇa volume I No. 2 page 236 and volume II No. 1 and 2 page 229).

60. PSL. page 24.

61. ALP. serial No. 1732.

62. AKT. volume 9 page 240.

63. VSL. page 199-201. A manuscript of Devanga Charitra (No. 931) of unknown authorship is in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.

64. SST. page 430.

65. NKS. first canto, stanza 7.

66. ARC. page 91 and 196.

67. MPM. page 89-93.

68. ARC. page 214.

69. AKT. volume 9, page 206.

70. AKT. volume 9, page 123.

71. AKT. volume 12, page 110.

72. ALP. serial No. 2919.

73. ALP. serial No. 2923.

ABBREVIATIONS USED.

AKT. Andhra Kavi Tarangini by Chaganti Seshaiah.

ALP. An Alphabetical Index of Telugu Manuscripts in the Govt.: Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras 1932 edition.

ARC. Andhra Rachaitalu by M. Satyanarayana Sastry.

NPV. Narsimhapurana-Uttarabhaga by Hari Bhattu.

MPM. Marugunapadina Manikyalu. By Dr. B. Ramaraju.

TVS. Telugu Vijnyana Sarvasvam.

SST. The Southern School in Telugu Literature. By N. Venkata Rao (Second edition).

IVS. Introduction to Vishupurana (1939) of Surana by Seshadri Ramana Kavulu.

VSL. Veerasaiva Literature. By S. Ramakrishna Sastry.

DCT. A descriptive catalogue of the Telugu Manuscripts in the Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Saraswati Mahal Library (Andhra University publication 1933).

PKV. Peettika in Kumarvijayam by Mudigonda Veeresalinga Sastry (published in 1950).

TCM. A Triennial Catalogue of Manuscripts part 3 Telugu. Govt.: Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.

KKS. Kakateeyasanchika edited by Dr. M. Rama Rao.

PSL. Purana Samalochana of the Telugu Vamana-Purana by Janamanchi Venkata Subrahmanya Sarma.

NKS. Nirvachana Kumara Sambhavam.

पुराणसूक्तयः

सत्सङ्गः परमो ब्रह्मन्न लभ्येताकृतात्मनाम् ।
यदि लभ्येत विज्ञेयं पुण्यं जन्मान्तरार्जितम् ॥
(नारदीय पु०, वेंकटे०, १।४।३५)

रविर्हि रश्मिजालेन दिवा हन्ति बहिस्तमः ।
सन्तः सूक्तिमरीच्योघैश्चान्तर्ध्वान्तं हि सर्वदा ॥ (१।४।३७)

दुर्लभाः पुरुषा लोके भगवद्भक्तिलालसाः ।
तेषां सङ्गो भवेद्यस्य तस्य शान्तिर्हि शाश्वती ॥ (१।४।३८)

सम्पद्भिः संयुता चापि विपद्भिश्चापि सज्जनाः ।
सर्वथाऽन्यं न बाधन्ते स्वप्नेऽपि सुरसत्तमाः ॥ (१।४।७०)

नास्ति शान्तिसमो बन्धुर्नास्ति सत्यात्परं तपः ।
नास्ति मोक्षात्परो लाभो नास्ति गङ्गासमा नदी ॥ (१।६।६०)

यौवनं धनसंपत्तिः प्रभुत्वमविवेकिता ।
एकैकमप्यनर्थाय किमु यत्र चतुष्टयम् ॥ (१।७।१९)

असूयाविष्टे मनसि यदि सम्पत् प्रवर्तते ।
तुषाग्निं वायुसंयोगमिव जानीहि सुव्रत ॥ (१।७।१७)

तावत्पुत्राश्च पौत्राश्च धनधान्यगृहादयः ।
यावदीक्षेत लक्ष्मीशः कृपापाङ्गेन नारद ॥ (१।७।२५)

विवेकं हन्त्यहंकारस्त्वविवेकात्तु जीविनाम् ।
आपदः सम्भवन्त्येवेत्यहंकारं त्यजेत्ततः ॥ (१।७।३०)

नास्त्यकीर्तिसमो मृत्युर्नास्ति क्रोधसमो रिपुः ।
नास्ति निन्दासमं पापं नास्ति मोहसमासवः* ॥ (१।७।४१)

पण्डिते वापि मूर्खे वा दरिद्रे वा श्रियान्विते ।
दुर्वृत्ते वा सुवृत्ते वा मृत्योः सर्वत्र तुल्यता ॥ (१।७।५६)

---

* मोहसमासवः = मोहसम [:] आसवः (मद्यम्)। अपाणिनीयः द्विःसंधिः (Double Sandhi) छन्दोभङ्गनिरासाय ।

A SAMPLE EDITION OF THE MATSYA PURĀṆA TEXT

By Dr. V. Raghavan

[डा. वे० राघवन्‌महोदयैः सम्पाद्यमानस्य मत्स्यपुराणस्य काशिराजन्यास-संस्करणस्य प्रथमोऽध्यायोऽत्र आदर्शरूपेण प्रकाश्यते। पाठनिर्धारणाय पाठभेदोल्लेखार्थं च संवादितानां मत्स्यपुराणकोशानां मुद्रितसंस्करणानां च ये संकेताः प्रयुक्तास्तेऽत्र प्रारम्भे व्याख्याताः। कोशानां सविस्तरं विवरणं तु 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः प्रथमभागस्य प्रथमेऽङ्के द्रष्टव्यम्। तत्रैव च पाठभेद-लोप-आधिक्य-क्रमादिसाम्यमाश्रित्य कोशानां परस्परसम्बन्धोऽपि निर्दिष्टः, तदनुसृत्यैव तेषां क्रमश्च व्यवस्थापितः।]

Abbreviations used :

(*A*) *Printed Editions.*

आ. = आनन्दाश्रम edition of the Matsya Purāṇa
वे. = वेङ्कटेश्वर „ „ „ „
मुक. = कन्नड „ „ „ „
मुते. = तेलुगु „ „ „ „
मुव. = वङ्ग „ „ „ „
शब्द. = शब्दकल्पद्रुम कोश
(मु = मुद्रित, printed)

(*B*) *Manuscripts.*

ओ. = Oriyā (ओड़िया) MS., Utkal University, Cuttack.

ने. = Nevārī (नेवारी) Ms., No. 41/182 of Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra Library, Fort Ramnagar (Varanasi).

म. = Malayālam (मलयालम) MS., No. K 6749 of India office Library, London.

शा. = Śāradā (शारदा) MS ; No. 4481 of Scindhia Oriental Institute, Ujjain.

दे १ = Devanāgarī (D. देवनागरी), MS., No. 4646 of Scindhia Oriental Institute, Ujjain.

दे २ = D. MS., No. 4146 of University Library, Bombay.

दे ३ = D. MS., No. 124 of Chunnilal Gandhi Vidyā Bhavana, Surat.

दे ४ = D. MS., No. 108 of British Museum, London.

दे ५ = D. MS., No. E. 3549 of IO Library, London.

दे ६ = D. MS., No. 226 of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

दे ७ = D. MS., No. 28 of 1871-72, New No. 2, BORI, Poona.

दे ८ = D. MS., No. 119 of 1884-87, New No. 9 of BORI, Poona.